



UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California
Honorable Jennifer E. Niemann
Hearing Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025
Department A – Courtroom #11
Fresno, California

Unless otherwise ordered, all matters before the Honorable Jennifer E. Niemann shall be simultaneously: (1) **In Person** at, Courtroom #11 (Fresno hearings only), (2) via **ZoomGov Video**, (3) via **ZoomGov Telephone**, and (4) via **CourtCall**. You may choose any of these options unless otherwise ordered or stated below.

All parties who wish to appear at a hearing remotely must sign up by 4:00 p.m. **one business day** prior to the hearing. Information regarding how to sign up can be found on the **Remote Appearances** page of our website at <https://www.caeb.uscourts.gov/Calendar/CourtAppearances>. Each party who has signed up will receive a Zoom link or phone number, meeting I.D., and password via e-mail.

If the deadline to sign up has passed, parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the Courtroom Deputy for the Department holding the hearing.

Please also note the following:

- Parties in interest may connect to the video or audio feed free of charge and should select which method they will use to appear when signing up.
- Members of the public and the press appearing by ZoomGov may only listen in to the hearing using the zoom telephone number. Video appearances are not permitted.
- Members of the public and the press may not listen in to trials or evidentiary hearings, though they may appear in person in most instances.

To appear remotely for law and motion or status conference proceedings, you must comply with the following guidelines and procedures:

1. Review the [Pre-Hearing Dispositions](#) prior to appearing at the hearing.
2. Parties appearing via CourtCall are encouraged to review the [CourtCall Appearance Information](#).

If you are appearing by ZoomGov phone or video, please join at least 10 minutes prior to the start of the calendar and wait with your microphone muted until the matter is called.

Unauthorized Recording is Prohibited: Any recording of a court proceeding held by video or teleconference, including “screen shots” or other audio or visual copying of a hearing is prohibited. Violation may result in sanctions, including removal of court-issued media credentials, denial of entry to future hearings, or any other sanctions deemed necessary by the court. For more information on photographing, recording, or broadcasting Judicial Proceedings, please refer to Local Rule 173(a) of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS

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

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

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

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

Orders: Unless the court specifies in the tentative or final ruling that it will issue an order, the prevailing party shall lodge an order within 14 days of the final hearing on the matter.

THE COURT ENDEAVORS TO PUBLISH ITS RULINGS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. HOWEVER, CALENDAR PREPARATION IS ONGOING AND THESE RULINGS MAY BE REVISED OR UPDATED AT ANY TIME PRIOR TO 4:00 P.M. THE DAY BEFORE THE SCHEDULED HEARINGS. PLEASE CHECK AT THAT TIME FOR POSSIBLE UPDATES.

1. 24-13300-A-13 **IN RE: MICHAEL/MIRIAM BIAS**
DCF-2

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
6-17-2025 [94]

PACCAR FINANCIAL CORP./MV
PETER BUNTING/ATTY. FOR DBT.
DANIEL FLEMING/ATTY. FOR MV.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Continued to August 6, 2025 at 2:00 p.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

On June 20, 2025, the movant filed an amended notice of hearing continuing the hearing on the motion for relief from the automatic stay from July 17, 2025 at 9:30 a.m. to August 6, 2025 at 2:00 p.m. Doc. #103. However, Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(j) requires court approval for the continuance of a hearing. The movant did not seek court approval for continuing the hearing on this motion. The court will permit the continuance of this motion this one time notwithstanding the movant's failure to comply with LBR 9014-1(j).

The court encourages counsel for the movant to review the local rules to ensure compliance in future matters or those matters may be denied without prejudice for failure to comply with the local rules. The rules can be accessed on the court's website at <https://www.caeb.uscourts.gov/LocalRulesAndGeneralOrders>.

2. 24-13300-A-13 **IN RE: MICHAEL/MIRIAM BIAS**
PBB-5

MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF FRESNO CDFI DBA ACCESS PLUS CAPITAL
6-18-2025 [98]

MIRIAM BIAS/MV
PETER BUNTING/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The Moving Party shall submit a proposed order in conformance with the ruling below.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 28 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of creditors, the U.S. Trustee, or any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) may be deemed a waiver of any opposition 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 above-mentioned

parties in interest are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amount of damages). Televideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires a moving party make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movants have done here.

Michael Bias and Miriam Wanda Bias ("Debtors"), the debtors in this chapter 13 case, move the court for an order valuing Debtors' 2020 Great Dane Reefer ("Trailer"), which is the collateral of Fresno CDFI dba Access Plus Capital ("Creditor") for business loans provided by Creditor to Debtors. Doc. #98; Claim 19-1; Attachment 1 to Claim 19-1.

On January 31, 2025, Debtors moved the court for an order valuing Creditor's collateral consisting of the Trailer and a 2013 Kenworth T660 (together, "Vehicles") at a combined value of \$80,000.00. Doc. #47. Creditor's proof of claim stated a secured claim of \$91,414.70. Claim 19-1. On March 21, 2025, the court entered an order valuing the Vehicles at \$80,000.00. Order, Doc. #69. Subsequently, Debtors assert that they have surrendered the 2013 Kenworth T660 and are seeking to value Creditor's collateral based solely on the Trailer. Decl. of Miriam Wanda Bias, Doc. #100; Am. Plan, Doc. #108.

11 U.S.C. § 1325(a) (*) (the hanging paragraph) permits the debtor to value personal property at its current value, as opposed to the amount due on the loan, if the loan is not a purchase money security interest secured by the property. Here, the current loan is a business loan agreement executed on January 30, 2019 that was not specifically entered into for the purchase of the Vehicles, so Creditor does not hold a purchase money security interest in the Trailer. Thus, the hanging paragraph of 11 U.S.C. § 1325 does not preclude Debtor from bifurcating Creditor's claim.

11 U.S.C. § 506(a)(1) limits a secured creditor's claim "to the extent of the value of such creditor's interest in the estate's interest in such property . . . and is an unsecured claim to the extent that the value of such creditor's interest . . . is less than the amount of such allowed claim." 11 U.S.C. § 506(a)(2) states that the value of personal property securing an allowed claim shall be determined based on the replacement value of such property as of the petition filing date.

Creditor's proof of claim values the Vehicles at \$91,414.70. Claim 19-1. Debtors assert the replacement value for the Trailer is \$55,000.00 and ask the court for an order valuing the Trailer at \$55,000.00. Decl. of Miriam Wanda Bias, Doc. #100. As the owner, Debtors' opinion of value is evidence of the value of the Trailer. See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004). Because Creditor did not oppose the motion and Debtors are competent to testify as to the value of the Trailer, the court accepts Debtors' valuation of the Trailer.

The motion is GRANTED. Creditor's secured claim will be fixed at \$55,000.00. The proposed order shall specifically identify the collateral, and if applicable, the proof of claim to which it relates. The order will be effective upon confirmation of the chapter 13 plan.

3. [25-11309](#)-A-13 **IN RE: SANTIAGO BETERAN**
[LGT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
6-9-2025 [\[17\]](#)

LILIAN TSANG/MV

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Continued to August 28, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Santiago Ramirez Beteran ("Debtor") filed a voluntary petition under chapter 13 on April 23, 2025, and a chapter 13 plan ("Plan") on May 7, 2025. Doc. ##1, 11. The chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the Plan on the grounds that: (1) Debtor needs to file amended Schedules H, I and J; (2) the Plan is not feasible because the monthly Plan payment needs to be increased to provide for the proposed plan payments to the secured creditor and Trustee's compensation; and (3) the Plan does not provide for payment of the priority claim filed by the Franchise Tax Board. Doc. #20.

This objection will be continued to August 28, 2025. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or Trustee's objection to confirmation is withdrawn, Debtor shall file and serve a written response no later than August 14, 2025. The response shall specifically address each issue raised in the objection to confirmation, state whether the issue is disputed or undisputed, and include admissible evidence to support Debtor's position. Trustee shall file and serve a reply, if any, by August 21, 2025.

If Debtor elects to withdraw this plan and file a modified plan in lieu of filing a response, then a confirmable modified plan shall be filed, served, and set for hearing, not later than August 21, 2025. If Debtor does not timely file a modified plan or a written response, this objection to confirmation will be sustained on the grounds stated in Trustee's objection without a further hearing.

4. [24-12212](#)-A-13 **IN RE: JOSEF/TAMARA KONYA**
[NLG-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
6-18-2025 [\[42\]](#)

CARRINGTON MORTGAGE SERVICES, LLC/MV
RAJ WADHWANI/ATTY. FOR DBT.
NICHOLE GLOWIN/ATTY. FOR MV.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

5. [25-11414](#)-A-13 **IN RE: TONI PROPE**
[LGT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
6-11-2025 [[12](#)]

LILIAN TSANG/MV
BENNY BARCO/ATTY. FOR DBT.
WITHDRAWN

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

Movant withdrew the objection to confirmation of the plan on June 26, 2025.
Doc. #15.

6. [25-11119](#)-A-13 **IN RE: GENEVA FARR**
[LGT-1](#)

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
5-13-2025 [[16](#)]

LILIAN TSANG/MV
JERRY LOWE/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Dropped as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

The debtor filed an amended plan on July 10, 2025 (JRL-1, Doc. #48), with a motion to confirm the amended plan set for hearing on August 14, 2025. Doc. ##46-52. Therefore, this motion is DROPPED AS MOOT.

7. [25-11119](#)-A-13 **IN RE: GENEVA FARR**
[RDW-1](#)

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LUSO AMERICAN FINANCIAL
5-13-2025 [[13](#)]

LUSO AMERICAN FINANCIAL/MV
JERRY LOWE/ATTY. FOR DBT.
REILLY WILKINSON/ATTY. FOR MV.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Dropped as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

The debtor filed an amended plan on July 10, 2025 (JRL-1, Doc. #48), with a motion to confirm the amended plan set for hearing on August 14, 2025. Doc. ##46-52. Therefore, this motion is DROPPED AS MOOT.

8. [25-10724](#)-A-13 **IN RE: APRIL MAGANO**
[LGT-2](#)

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
6-12-2025 [\[33\]](#)

LILIAN TSANG/MV
PETER BUNTING/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The court will issue the order.

Unless the trustee's motion is withdrawn before the hearing, the motion will be granted without oral argument for cause shown.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 28 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of creditors, the debtor, the U.S. Trustee, or any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) may be deemed a waiver of any opposition 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 above-mentioned parties in interest are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amount of damages). Televideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires a movant make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

Here, the chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") asks the court to dismiss this case for unreasonable delay by the debtor that is prejudicial to creditors (11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1)) and because the debtor has failed to provide required documents (11 U.S.C. § 521). Doc. #33. Specifically, Trustee asks the court to dismiss this case for the debtor's failure to: (1) provide Trustee with all of the documentation required by 11 U.S.C. § 521 and the local rules, including all pages of the debtor's most recent federal tax return, pay advices for the full six months prior to when the debtor filed this bankruptcy case, and proof of other income listed on the debtor's schedules and forms; (2) commence making plan payments due under the debtor's plan, resulting in a delinquency amount of \$3,870.00 as of June 12, 2025; and (3) appear at the scheduled § 341 meeting of creditors. Doc. #33; Decl. of Karina Rodriguez, Doc. #35. The debtor did not file written opposition.

Under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c), the court may convert or dismiss a case, whichever is in the best interests of creditors and the estate, for cause. "A debtor's unjustified failure to expeditiously accomplish any task required either to propose or to confirm a chapter 13 plan may constitute cause for dismissal under § 1307(c)(1)." Ellsworth v. Lifescape Med. Assocs., P.C. (In re Ellsworth), 455 B.R. 904, 915 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2011). There is "cause" for

dismissal under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1) for unreasonable delay by the debtor that is prejudicial to creditors and 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(3) for failing to accomplish the tasks required by the proposed plan and failing to confirm a chapter 13 plan. Cause also exists under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(4) to dismiss this case as the debtor has failed to make all payments due under the plan.

A review of the debtor's Schedules A/B, C and D shows that the debtor has minimal equity in non-exempt assets. Doc. #13. Because there is no equity to be realized for the benefit of the estate and because the debtor has failed to appear at the 341 meeting of creditors, dismissal, rather than conversion to chapter 7, is in the best interests of creditors and the estate.

Accordingly, this motion will be GRANTED. The case will be dismissed.

9. [25-11724](#)-A-13 **IN RE: HEATHER ROBINSON**
[JCW-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
6-24-2025 [\[22\]](#)

U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION/MV
KRISTIN SCHULER-HINTZ/ATTY. FOR MV.
DISMISSED 06/26/2025

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Denied without prejudice.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This matter is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for improper notice.

This bankruptcy case was dismissed on June 26, 2025 for the debtor's failure to timely file all required documents. Order, Doc. #29. Therefore, prospective relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) is moot pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(B). In the dismissal order, however, the court retained jurisdiction to rule on and enter an order with respect to the movant's motion for relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4). Order, Doc. #29.

The mandatory certificate of service form filed with this motion (Doc. #28) is not completed properly. Section 4 of the mandatory certificate of service form does not include the date on which parties in interest were served with the motion and supporting documents. Because no date is listed, the court cannot determine whether the parties were served timely, and the motion is denied without prejudice for improper notice.

As a further procedural matter, notice of this motion was filed on June 24, 2025, with a hearing date set for July 17, 2025. The motion and supporting declaration were signed and filed on June 24, 2025, so the earliest date that the moving papers could have been served is 23 days prior to the hearing. Because the motion was set for hearing on less than 28 days' notice, the motion is governed by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(2). Pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(2), written opposition was not required, and any opposition may be raised at the hearing. However, the notice of hearing filed with the motion states that written opposition must be filed and served no later than fourteen days before the hearing and failure to file written response may result in the court granting the motion prior to the hearing. Therefore, the notice of

hearing does not comply with LBR 9014-1(f)(2), and the motion is denied without prejudice for improper notice.

As a further procedural matter, the certificate of service filed with this motion (Doc. #28) does not comply with LBR 9004-1(c)(1)(B), which states that signatures of persons other than the registered user may be indicated "[t]hrough the use of '/s/Name' or a software-generated electronic signature in the signature block where signatures would otherwise appear." Here, "M MailDateMNDC" appears on the signature line in Section 6 as well as the print name line and in Section 4 where the date on which parties in interest were served should have been entered.

The court encourages counsel to review the local rules to ensure compliance in future matters or those matters may be denied without prejudice for failure to comply with the applicable rules. The local rules can be accessed on the court's website at <https://www.caeb.uscourts.gov/LocalRulesAndGeneralOrders>.

10. [24-12327](#)-A-13 **IN RE: ROBERT NAVARRA AND GEMMA CASIANO-NAVARRA**
[FW-2](#)

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION BY THE LAW OFFICE OF FEAR WADDELL, P.C. FOR
PETER A. SAUER, DEBTORS ATTORNEY(S)
6-18-2025 [\[46\]](#)

PETER SAUER/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The Moving Party shall submit a proposed order in conformance
with the ruling below.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 28 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of creditors, the U.S. Trustee, or any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) may be deemed a waiver of any opposition 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 above-mentioned parties in interest are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amount of damages). Televideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires a moving party make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

Fear Waddell, P.C. ("Movant"), counsel for Robert Michael Martinez Navarra and Gemma Casiano-Navarra (together, "Debtors"), the debtors in this chapter 13 case, requests interim allowance of compensation in the amount of \$21,498.00 and reimbursement for expenses in the amount of \$42.22 for services rendered from January 5, 2024 through May 31, 2025. Doc. #46. Debtors' confirmed plan provides, in addition to \$2,687.00 paid prior to filing the case, for \$25,200.00 in attorney's fees to be paid through the plan. Plan, Doc. #3. No prior fee application has been filed. Debtors consent to the amount requested in Movant's application. Ex. E, Doc. #48.

Section 330(a) of the Bankruptcy Code authorizes "reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services rendered" and "reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses" to a debtor's attorney in a chapter 13 case. 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1), (4)(B). The court may allow reasonable compensation to the chapter 13 debtor's attorney for representing interests of the debtor in connection with the bankruptcy case. 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4). In determining the amount of reasonable compensation, the court shall consider the nature, extent, and value of such services, taking into account all relevant factors. 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(3).

Here, Movant demonstrates services rendered relating to: (1) prepetition consultation with Debtors and fact gathering, including independently verifying information; (2) preparing voluntary petition, schedules and related forms and amendments thereto; (3) preparing for and attending 341 meeting of creditors; (4) preparing and prosecuting Debtors' original chapter 13 plan; (5) claim administration and claim objections; (6) corresponding with various parties by email; (7) preparing and filing a motion to value collateral of a secured creditor; (8) preparing the fee application; and (9) general case administration. Exs. B, C & D. Doc. #48. The court finds that the compensation and reimbursement sought are reasonable, actual, and necessary, and the court will approve the motion.

This motion is GRANTED. The court allows on an interim basis compensation in the amount of \$21,498.00 and reimbursement for expenses in the amount of \$42.22 to be paid in a manner consistent with the terms of the confirmed plan.

11. [25-11545](#)-A-13 **IN RE: JACOB BRAUN AND ARIANA MILLA**
[LGT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
6-11-2025 [\[12\]](#)

LILIAN TSANG/MV
PETER BUNTING/ATTY. FOR DBT.
WITHDRAWN

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

Movant withdrew the objection to confirmation of the plan on June 25, 2025.
Doc. #16.

MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF TULARE COUNTY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
6-10-2025 [\[11\]](#)

DANIELA SILVA OCHOA/MV
GABRIEL WADDELL/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The Moving Party shall submit a proposed order in conformance with the ruling below.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 28 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of creditors, the U.S. Trustee, or any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) may be deemed a waiver of any opposition 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 above-mentioned parties in interest are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amount of damages). Televideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires a moving party make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movants have done here.

Daniela Monserrat Silva Ochoa ("Debtor"), the debtor in this chapter 13 case, moves the court for an order valuing Debtor's 2019 Audi A4, VIN: WAUGMAF48KN008322 ("Vehicle"), which is the collateral of Tulare County Federal Credit Union ("Creditor"). Doc. #11; Decl. of Daniela Silva Ochoa, Doc. #13.

11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(*) (the hanging paragraph) permits the debtor to value a motor vehicle acquired for the personal use of the debtor at its current value, as opposed to the amount due on the loan, if the loan was a purchase money security interest secured by the property and the debt was not incurred within the 910-day period preceding the date of filing. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a)(1) limits a secured creditor's claim "to the extent of the value of such creditor's interest in the estate's interest in such property . . . and is an unsecured claim to the extent that the value of such creditor's interest . . . is less than the amount of such allowed claim." 11 U.S.C. § 506(a)(2) states that the value of personal property securing an allowed claim shall be determined based on the replacement value of such property as of the petition filing date. "Replacement value" where the personal property is "acquired for personal, family, or household purposes" means "the price a retail merchant would charge for property of that kind considering the age and condition of the property at the time value is determined." 11 U.S.C. § 506(a)(2).

Debtor has a loan with Creditor secured by the Vehicle in the amount of \$16,676.98. Doc. #11. Creditor's claim was incurred by Debtor more than 910 days before filing this bankruptcy case. Ochoa Decl., Doc. #13. Debtor asserts the replacement value of the Vehicle is \$13,763.00 and asks the court for an order valuing the Vehicle at \$13,763.00. Id. As the owner, Debtor's

opinion of value is evidence of the value of the Vehicle. See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004). Because Creditor did not oppose the motion and Debtor is competent to testify as to the value of the Vehicle, the court accepts Debtor's valuation of the Vehicle.

The motion is GRANTED. Creditor's secured claim will be fixed at \$13,763.00. The proposed order shall specifically identify the collateral, and if applicable, the proof of claim to which it relates. The order will be effective upon confirmation of the chapter 13 plan.

13. [25-11061](#)-A-13 **IN RE: ARNULFO MUNOZ-GONZALES**
[NSV-1](#)

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
6-5-2025 [\[46\]](#)

ARNULFO MUNOZ-GONZALES/MV
NIMA VOKSHORI/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Continued to August 28, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 35 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice 3015-1(d)(1). The chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") and creditor SV Quick Capital Corporation ("Creditor") filed objections to the debtor's motion to confirm the chapter 13 plan. Doc. ##52, 60. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or Trustee and Creditor's opposition to confirmation are withdrawn, the debtor shall file and serve a written response no later than August 14, 2025. The response shall specifically address each issue raised in the objections to confirmation, state whether the issue is disputed or undisputed, and include admissible evidence to support the debtor's position. Trustee and Creditor shall file and serve a reply, if any, by August 21, 2025.

If the debtor elects to withdraw this plan and file a modified plan in lieu of filing a response, then a confirmable modified plan shall be filed, served, and set for hearing, not later than August 21, 2025. If the debtor does not timely file a modified plan or a written response, this motion will be denied on the grounds stated in the oppositions of Trustee and/or Creditor without a further hearing.

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY WELLS FARGO BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
6-30-2025 [\[69\]](#)

WELLS FARGO BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION/MV
ONYINYE ANYAMA/ATTY. FOR DBT.
DAVID COATS/ATTY. FOR MV.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Consolidated with the debtor's motion to confirm (Doc. #81).

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

On June 30, 2025, Wells Fargo Bank, National Association, as Trustee, for the Structured Asset Securities Corporation Mortgage Loan Trust 2007-OSI, by and through its authorized loan servicing agent, PHH Mortgage ("Creditor"), filed an objection to confirmation of the chapter 13 plan of Romelia Ferrel ("Debtor"), the debtor in this chapter 13 case, and set its objection to confirmation for hearing on July 17, 2025. Doc. #69. This procedure would have been proper pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 3015-1(c) had Creditor's objection to confirmation been filed with respect to Debtor's original chapter 13 plan. However, that is not the case.

Debtor filed an amended plan on May 30, 2025, but did not file a motion to confirm the plan as required by LBR 3015-1(d)(1) until July 8, 2025, when Debtor filed a motion to confirm the amended plan and set that motion for hearing on August 6, 2025 at 2:00 p.m. Doc. ##60, 81-85. This objection to confirmation should have been filed as a response/opposition to Debtor's motion to confirm her chapter 13 plan [Doc. #81] and will be consolidated with Debtor's motion to confirm the amended plan that is set for hearing on August 6, 2025 at 2:00 p.m.¹

As an informative matter, the certificate of service filed in connection with this objection to confirmation (Doc. #71) was filed as a fillable version of the court's Official Certificate of Service form (EDC Form 7-005, Rev. 10/2022) instead of being printed prior to filing with the court. The version that was filed with the court can be altered because it is still the fillable version. In the future, the declarant should print the completed certificate of service form prior to filing and not file the fillable version.

The court encourages counsel to review the local rules to ensure compliance in future matters or those matters may be denied without prejudice for failure to comply with the local rules. The rules can be accessed on the court's website at <https://www.caeb.uscourts.gov/LocalRulesAndGeneralOrders>.

Accordingly, this objection to confirmation is consolidated with the motion to confirm the debtor's plan, Doc. #60.

¹ On July 14, 2025, Debtor filed a second amended notice of hearing continuing the hearing on the motion to confirm the amended plan to August 27, 2025 at 9:30 a.m. Doc. #91. However, August 27, 2025 at 9:30 a.m. is not a chapter 13 calendar date in this court; the correct calendar date is August 28, 2025 at 9:30 a.m. Also, LBR 9014-1(j) requires court approval for the continuance of a hearing, which was not done. Because Debtor's notice of the continued hearing is defective, the hearing on Debtor's motion to confirm the amended plan remains set for August 6, 2025 at 2:00 p.m.

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
7-3-2025 [\[18\]](#)

EDUCATIONAL EMPLOYEES CREDIT UNION/MV
PETER MACALUSO/ATTY. FOR DBT.
DON POOL/ATTY. FOR MV.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Continued to August 28, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the hearing.

This motion was filed and served on at least 14 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(2) and will proceed as scheduled. Though not required, the debtor filed written opposition to the motion on July 10, 2025. Doc. #25. Further opposition may be presented at the hearing, and this matter will proceed as scheduled.

As an informative matter, the movant incorrectly completed Section 6 of the court's mandatory Certificate of Service form. In Section 6, the declarant marked that service was effectuated by Rule 5 and Rules 7005, 9036 Service. Doc. #24. However, Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure ("Rule") 4001(a)(1) and 9014(b) require service of a motion for relief from stay to be made pursuant to Rule 7004, which was done here. In Section 6, the declarant should have checked the appropriate box under Section 6A, not Section 6B.

The movant, Educational Employees Credit Union ("Movant"), seeks relief from the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) and (d)(2) with respect to a 2021 Dodge Challenger SXT Coupe 2D, VIN: 2C3CDZAG6MH564243 ("Vehicle"). Doc. #18.

The court grants Movant's request to take judicial notice of pleadings filed in the bankruptcy case and the debtor's prior bankruptcy case. The court may take judicial notice of all documents and papers filed in this case and the prior bankruptcy case also filed in this court. Fed. R. Evid. 201; Bank of Am., N.A. v. CD-04, Inc. (In re Owner Mgmt. Serv., LLC), 530 B.R. 711, 717 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2015).

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) allows the court to grant relief from the stay for cause, including the lack of adequate protection. "Because there is no clear definition of what constitutes 'cause,' discretionary relief from the stay must be determined on a case by case basis." In re Mac Donald, 755 F.2d 715, 717 (9th Cir. 1985).

Movant and Magdalena Puentes Juraz ("Debtor") entered into a loan and security agreement and disclosure statement ("Loan Obligation") on November 22, 2021 in the amount of \$33,947.10 for the purchase of the Vehicle. Decl. of Amber Luna, Doc. #22; Ex. A, Doc. #23. Pursuant to the Loan Obligation, Debtor agreed to make minimum monthly payments of \$613.28 with an interest rate of 12.79%. Luna Decl., Doc. #22. Debtor defaulted on making payments pursuant to the Loan Obligation as of October 2024. Id. Movant further asserts that Debtor failed to maintain insurance on the Vehicle, and Movant has "force-placed" insurance as

of April 2025. Id. Movant has provided evidence that Debtor is nine (9) payments past due in the aggregate amount of \$5,519.52. Id.

Debtor filed this bankruptcy case on June 25, 2025. Doc. #1. Prior to filing this bankruptcy case, Debtor filed a chapter 13 case, Case No. 25-10573 (Bankr. E.D. Cal.) ("Prior Case"), on February 27, 2025, which was dismissed on June 12, 2025. Case No. 25-10573, Doc. ## 1, 63. In the Prior Case, Debtor failed to: (i) make plan payments, (ii) attend the 341 meeting of creditors; and (iii) file a motion to value, which resulted in the Chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") filing a Motion to Dismiss Case on May 8, 2025. Case No. 25-10573, Doc. #39. An order granting Trustee's motion to dismiss was entered on June 12, 2025. Case No. 25-10573, Doc. #63. Debtor filed a non-opposition to the court granting Trustee's motion to dismiss in the Prior Case. Case No. 25-10573, Doc. #49.

Debtor scheduled Movant's secured claim at \$25,963.00. Schedule D, Doc. #9. Movant asserts its claim is \$31,483.14 as of June 25, 2025, which excludes attorneys' fees and the amount advanced for force-placed insurance. Luna Decl., Doc. #22. Debtor's Schedules A/B and D value the Vehicle at \$14,000. Schedules A/B & D, Doc. #9.

In Debtor's response to this motion, Debtor asserts there is insufficient cause to grant the relief from stay because Debtor has classified the Vehicle as a Class 2(B) Claim in her proposed chapter 13 plan, Debtor is current on her plan payments, and the Vehicle has valid insurance. Doc. #25; Ex. 1, Doc. #26.

While Debtor's opposition asserts that Debtor is current on her chapter 13 plan payments in this case, there is no declaration filed by Debtor to support that statement. Doc. #25. Because there is no evidence presented that Debtor is current on her plan payments, there is no basis for the court to determine that Debtor has taken the necessary steps to show that Movant's claim will be paid through a confirmed chapter 13 plan. Likewise, while Debtor filed an exhibit showing California Evidence of Liability Insurance, there is no declaration authenticating that exhibit. Doc. #26.

Further, while Debtor has listed Movant's claim in Class 2, the plan proposes to pay only the value of the Vehicle securing that claim. Plan, Doc. #10. Section 3.08(c) states "the amount of a Class 2 claim is determined by applicable nonbankruptcy law and Debtor may reduce the claim amount to the value of the collateral securing it by filing, serving, setting for hearing, and prevailing on a motion to determine the value of that collateral. If this plan proposes to reduce a claim based upon the value of its collateral, the failure to successfully prosecute a valuation motion in conjunction with plan confirmation may result in the denial of confirmation." To date, Debtor has not filed, served and set for hearing a motion to value the Vehicle. Failure of Debtor to timely file, serve and set for hearing a motion to value the Vehicle may constitute cause to lift the automatic stay in favor of Movant.

Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(e), the automatic stay is terminated 30 days after a motion for relief is made unless the court continues the stay as a result of a final hearing or, pending final hearing, after a preliminary hearing. If a preliminary hearing is held, 11 U.S.C. § 362(e) requires the final hearing to be commenced within 30 days after the preliminary hearing.

Based on the opposition filed by Debtor, the court is inclined to treat this hearing as a preliminary hearing and continue the hearing on this motion to August 28, 2025 at 9:30 a.m. as a final hearing to allow Debtor to supplement the record with respect to Debtor's efforts to confirm and comply with her chapter 13 plan, including taking the necessary steps to value Movant's collateral for plan confirmation purposes.

MOTION TO EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY
7-3-2025 [\[13\]](#)

MAGDALENA PUENTES JURAZ/MV
PETER MACALUSO/ATTY. FOR DBT.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Stay extended until August 8, 2025, and hearing continued to August 6, 2025 at 2:00 p.m. to permit the debtor to supplement the record.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the hearing.

This motion was filed and served on at least 14 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(2) and will proceed as scheduled. Unless opposition is presented at the hearing, the court intends to enter the respondents' defaults, extend the stay for a short period of time and continue the hearing on the motion to permit the debtor to supplement the record with respect to this motion. If opposition is presented at the hearing, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(2). The court will issue an order if a further hearing is necessary.

Magdalena Puentes Juraz ("Debtor") moves the court for an order extending the automatic stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B). Doc. #13.

Debtor had a chapter 13 case pending within the preceding one-year period that was dismissed, Case No. 25-10573 (Bankr. E.D. Cal.) ("Prior Case"). The Prior Case was filed on February 27, 2025 and dismissed on June 12, 2025. Decl. of Magdalena Puentes Juraz, Doc. #15. Under 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(A), if a debtor had a bankruptcy case pending within the preceding one-year period that was dismissed, then the automatic stay with respect to any action taken with respect to a debt or property securing such debt or with respect to any lease shall terminate with respect to the debtor on the 30th day after the filing of the current case. Debtor filed this case on June 25, 2025. Petition, Doc. #1. The automatic stay will terminate in the present case on July 25, 2025.

Section 362(c)(3)(B) allows the court to extend the stay "to any or all creditors (subject to such conditions or limitations as the court may then impose) after notice and a hearing completed before the expiration of the 30-day period only if the party in interest demonstrates that the filing of the later case is in good faith as to the creditors to be stayed[.]" 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B).

Section 362(c)(3)(C)(i) creates a presumption that the case was filed not in good faith if the debtor: (1) filed more than one prior case in the preceding year; (2) failed to file or amend the petition or other documents without substantial excuse, provide adequate protection as ordered by the court, or perform the terms of a confirmed plan; or (3) has not had a substantial change in his or her financial or personal affairs since the dismissal, or there is no other reason to believe that the current case will result in a discharge or fully performed plan. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C)(i).

The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C). Under the clear and convincing standard, the evidence presented by the movant must "place in the ultimate factfinder an abiding conviction that the truth of its factual contentions are 'highly probable.'" Factual contentions are highly probable if the evidence offered in support of them instantly tilt[s] the evidentiary scales in the affirmative when weighed against the evidence offered in opposition." Emmert v. Taggart (In re Taggart), 548 B.R. 275, 288 n.11 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2016) (citations omitted) vacated and remanded on other grounds by Taggart v. Lorenzen, 139 S. Ct. 1795 (2019).

In this case, the presumption of bad faith arises. In the Prior Case, Debtor failed to (i) make plan payments, (ii) attend the 341 meeting of creditors, and (iii) file a motion to value. A review of the court's docket in the Prior Case discloses a chapter 13 plan was never confirmed. The chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") filed a motion to dismiss the Prior Case on May 8, 2025, and an order granting this motion was entered on June 12, 2025. Case No. 25-10573, Doc. #39, 63. Debtor filed a non-opposition to the granting of the motion to dismiss in the Prior Case. Case No. 25-10573, Doc. #49.

In support of this motion to extend the automatic stay, Debtor declares that the plan payments in the Prior Case were not made because Debtor was unemployed and unemployment benefits were her only income. Juraz Decl., Doc. #15. Debtor states she is now employed and in a better position to continue this bankruptcy case. Id. Further, Debtor states that she had several hardships that prevented her from paying her plan payments such as the loss of a parent and her daughter being hospitalized. Id.

Comparing Debtor's current proposed plan with the proposed plan in the Prior Case, it appears that Debtor's monthly plan payments will be \$115.00 more than in the Prior Case (\$650.00 in the current case and \$535.00 in the Prior Case). Doc. #10; Prior Case, Case No. 25-10573, Doc. #17. Further, it appears Debtor's net monthly income has slightly increased when comparing the net monthly income in the Prior Case with the net monthly income in the current case based on Debtor's filed schedules (\$650.60 in the current case and \$535.60 in the Prior Case) and that increase is attributed to an increase in Debtor's boyfriend's contribution and is not a reflection of Debtor's changed employment status. Doc. #9; Prior Case, Case No. 25-10573, Doc. #17. Both Schedules I and J filed in the current case and the Prior Case disclose that Debtor was employed by Adventist Health, and it appears from the schedules that Debtor was never unemployed. Id. Because there is no indication on the schedules or a further explanation in Debtor's declaration as to when Debtor was unemployed, the court cannot determine whether Debtor's financial situation has changed in the current case as compared to the Prior Case.

A further review of the court's docket in the Prior Case shows that Debtor's case also was dismissed because Debtor failed to attend any 341 meetings of creditor in the Prior Case and failed to file a motion to value the same collateral that is now listed in Debtor's plan in the current case. Because the Prior Case is almost identical to the current case filed, Debtor must address each ground raised by Trustee in the motion to dismiss the Prior Case before this court can determine that Debtor filed the current case in good faith.

Accordingly, the court finds that Debtor has not met her burden of rebutting the presumption that this case was not filed in good faith because the pleadings filed with the motion fail to explain a substantial change in Debtor's financial or personal affairs since the dismissal of the Prior Case or provide any reason to believe that the current case will result in a discharge or fully performed plan as required under 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C). Rather than allow the stay under 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) to terminate pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C), the court is inclined to extend the automatic stay for a

limited time to permit Debtor to supplement her motion and rebut the presumption by clear and convincing evidence that this chapter 13 case is not filed in good faith.

For the reasons discussed above, Debtor's case "is presumptively filed not in good faith." 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C). Debtor has not rebutted this presumption by clear and convincing evidence in the pleadings currently filed with the motion. The court will extend the automatic stay until August 8, 2025 and will continue the hearing on this motion to August 6, 2025 at 2:00 p.m. Debtor shall file pleadings to supplement her motion to extend the stay no later than July 23, 2025. If Debtor does not timely file any supplemental pleadings, a further extension of the automatic stay will be denied without a further hearing. Any response to the supplemental pleadings shall be filed and served no later than July 30, 2025.

1. [24-12400](#)-A-7 **IN RE: WILLIAM SETTY**
[25-1016](#)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE REGARDING DISMISSAL OF ADVERSARY PROCEEDING FOR
FAILURE TO PROSECUTE
6-12-2025 [[13](#)]

U.S. TRUSTEE V. SETTY
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: The order to show cause will be vacated.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

On June 12, 2025, this court issued an order to show cause ("OSC") why this adversary proceeding should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution for the failure of the plaintiff to appear at the initial status conference held on June 11, 2025 at 3:00 p.m. Doc. #13. The OSC required any written response to be filed and served on or before July 3, 2025.

On July 3, 2025, counsel for the plaintiff filed a declaration explaining that counsel wrongly assumed that the status conference would be taken off calendar because the court had already entered the defendant's default. Decl. of Michael J. Fletcher, Doc. #23.

Based on the explanation provided by counsel for the plaintiff, the court finds that the failure of the plaintiff to appear at the June 11, 2025 status conference to be excusable, and the court will not dismiss the adversary proceeding for lack of prosecution as set forth in the OSC. The OSC is vacated.

2. [24-12400](#)-A-7 **IN RE: WILLIAM SETTY**
[25-1016](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
4-11-2025 [[1](#)]

U.S. TRUSTEE V. SETTY
MICHAEL FLETCHER/ATTY. FOR PL.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Continue to August 6, 2025 at 3:00 p.m.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the hearing.

Because the plaintiff has set a motion for entry of default judgment for hearing on August 6, 2025 at 3:00 p.m., the court intends to continue this status conference to August 6, 2025 at 3:00 p.m. to be heard in connection with the hearing on the plaintiff's motion for entry of default judgment.

3. [24-12145](#)-A-7 **IN RE: ERIK LUNA**
[24-1032](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: AMENDED COMPLAINT
10-10-2024 [[8](#)]

FEAR V. FRANCO ET AL
PETER SAUER/ATTY. FOR PL.
DISMISSED 06/19/2025

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

This adversary proceeding was dismissed by stipulation on June 19, 2025.
Doc. #33.

4. [24-13371](#)-A-7 **IN RE: RICARDO/INDIRA TREVINO**
[25-1005](#) [CAE-1](#)

STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
1-29-2025 [[1](#)]

MONDRAGON ET AL V. TREVINO, JR.
HECTOR MARTINEZ/ATTY. FOR PL.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

5. [17-13776](#)-A-7 **IN RE: JESSICA GREER**
[18-1017](#)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
6-26-2025 [[162](#)]

SALVEN V. CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FOOD &
DISMISSED 07/01/2025

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Dropped as moot.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

This adversary proceeding was dismissed by stipulation on July 1, 2025.
Doc. #166. Therefore, the order to show cause will be dropped as moot.

6. [17-13776](#)-A-7 **IN RE: JESSICA GREER**
[18-1017](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
4-23-2018 [[1](#)]

SALVEN V. CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FOOD &
SHARLENE ROBERTS-CAUDLE/ATTY. FOR PL.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING
DISMISSED 07/01/2025

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

This adversary proceeding was dismissed by stipulation on July 1, 2025.
Doc. #166.

7. [24-10680](#)-A-7 **IN RE: CENTRAL CALIFORNIA CARTAGE CO, INC**
[24-1053](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
12-2-2024 [[1](#)]

EDMONDS V. RYDER TRUCK RENTAL, INC.
ANTHONY JOHNSTON/ATTY. FOR PL.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Continue to September 18, 2025 at 11:00 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Pursuant to the plaintiff's status conference statement filed on July 8, 2025
(Doc. #24), the status conference is continued to September 18, 2025 at
11:00 a.m.

The plaintiff shall file and serve a further status report on or before
September 11, 2025 if this adversary proceeding has not been dismissed by that
date.

8. [24-10680](#)-A-7 **IN RE: CENTRAL CALIFORNIA CARTAGE CO, INC**
[24-1054](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
12-2-2024 [[1](#)]

EDMONDS V. THE GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER COMPANY, INC.
ANTHONY JOHNSTON/ATTY. FOR PL.
DISMISSED 06/20/2025

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

This adversary proceeding was dismissed on June 20, 2025. Doc. #31.