

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Ronald H. Sargis

Chief Bankruptcy Judge

Modesto, California

August 25, 2022 at 10:30 a.m.

1. [20-90327-E-7](#)
[MDM-3](#)

PHILIP/DALLIA ENGLE
Gurjeet Rai

**MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR
MICHAEL D. MCGRANAHAN, CHAPTER
7 TRUSTEE(S)
8-1-22 [145]**

1 thru 2

Tentative Ruling: Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(C).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion—Hearing Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 7 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on August 1, 2022. By the court's calculation, 24 days' notice was provided. 21 days' notice is required. FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002(a)(6) (requiring twenty-one days' notice when requested fees exceed \$1,000.00).

The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Debtor, creditors, the Chapter 7 Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offer opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing, unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. At the hearing, -----

-----.

The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees is granted.
--

August 25, 2022 at 10:30 a.m.

- Page 1 of 11-

Michael D. McGranahan, the Chapter 7 Trustee, (“Applicant”) for the Estate of Philip Scott Engle and Dallia Desamito Engle (“Client”), makes a Request for the Allowance of Fees and Expenses in this case. Fees are requested for the period May 5, 2020 to August 25, 2022.

STATUTORY BASIS FOR FEES

11 U.S.C. § 330(a)

(1) After notice to the parties in interest and the United States Trustee and a hearing, and subject to sections 326, 328, and 329, the court may award to a trustee, a consumer privacy ombudsman appointed under section 332, an examiner, an ombudsman appointed under section 333, or a professional person employed under section 327 or 1103 —

(A) reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services rendered by the trustee, examiner, ombudsman, professional person, or attorney and by any paraprofessional person employed by any such person; and

(B) reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses.

In considering the allowance of fees for a professional employed by a trustee, the professional must “demonstrate only that the services were reasonably likely to benefit the estate at the time rendered,” not that the services resulted in actual, compensable, material benefits to the estate. *Ferrette & Slatter v. United States Tr. (In re Garcia)*, 335 B.R. 717, 724 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005) (citing *Roberts, Sheridan & Kotel, P.C. v. Bergen Brunswig Drug Co. (In re Mednet)*, 251 B.R. 103, 108 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2000)).

In considering the compensation awarded to a bankruptcy trustee, the Bankruptcy Code further provides:

(7) In determining the amount of reasonable compensation to be awarded to a trustee, the court shall treat such compensation as a commission, based on section 326.

11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(7). The fee percentages set in 11 U.S.C. § 326 expressly states that the percentages are the maximum fees that a trustee may received, and whatever compensation is allowed must be reasonable. 11 U.S.C. § 326(a).

Benefit to the Estate

Even if the court finds that the services billed by a trustee are “actual,” meaning that the fee application reflects time entries properly charged for services, the trustee must demonstrate still that the work performed was necessary and reasonable. *Unsecured Creditors’ Comm. v. Puget Sound Plywood, Inc. (In re Puget Sound Plywood)*, 924 F.2d 955, 958 (9th Cir. 1991). A trustee must exercise good billing judgment with regard to the services provided because the court’s authorization to employ a trustee to work in a bankruptcy case does not give that trustee “free reign to run up a [professional fees and expenses] tab without considering the maximum probable recovery,” as opposed to a possible recovery. *Id.*; see also *Brosio v. Deutsche Bank Nat’l Tr. Co. (In re Brosio)*, 505 B.R. 903, 913 n.7 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2014) (“Billing judgment is mandatory.”). According the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, prior to working on a legal matter, the attorney, or other professional as appropriate, is obligated to consider:

- (a) Is the burden of the probable cost of legal [or other professional] services disproportionately large in relation to the size of the estate and maximum probable recovery?
- (b) To what extent will the estate suffer if the services are not rendered?
- (c) To what extent may the estate benefit if the services are rendered and what is the likelihood of the disputed issues being resolved successfully?

In re Puget Sound Plywood, 924 F.2d at 958–59 (citing *In re Wildman*, 72 B.R. 700, 707 (N.D. Ill. 1987)).

A review of the application shows that Applicant’s services for the Estate include asset analysis, recovery, and disposition, case and claims administration, fee and employment applications, litigation, and tax matters. The Estate has \$190,624.22 of unencumbered monies to be administered as of the filing of the application. The court finds the services were beneficial to Client and the Estate and were reasonable.

FEES REQUESTED

Applicant provides a task billing analysis and supporting evidence for the services provided, which are described in the following main categories.

General Case Administration: Applicant spent 17.30 hours in this category.

Asset Analysis and Recovery: Applicant spent 39.40 hours in this category.

Asset Disposition: Applicant spent 10.70 hours in this category.

Claims Administration: Applicant spent 16.30 hours in this category.

Fee & Employment Applications: Applicant spent 2.30 hours in this category.

Litigation: Applicant spent 6.30 hours in this category.

Tax Matters: Applicant spent 2.50 hours in this category.

Applicant requests the following fees:

25% of the first \$5,000.00	\$1,250.00
10% of the next \$45,000.00	\$4,500.00
5% of the next \$950,000.00	\$15,877.98
Calculated Total Compensation	\$21,627.98
Reduction Due to Debtor’s Homestead Exemption	(\$3,880.95)
Total First and Final Fees Requested	\$17,747.03

FEES ALLOWED

The court finds that the requested fees are reasonable pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 326(a) and that Applicant effectively used appropriate rates for the services provided. First and Final Fees in the amount of \$17,747.03 are approved pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330 are authorized to be paid by the Chapter 7 Trustee from the available funds of the Estate in a manner consistent with the order of distribution in a Chapter 7 case.

In this case, the Chapter 7 Trustee currently has \$190,624.22 of unencumbered monies to be administered. The Chapter 7 Trustee provided general case administration and significant asset recovery and disposition work. Applicant's efforts have resulted in a realized gross of \$367,559.65 recovered for the estate. Dckt. 145.

This case required significant work by the Chapter 7 Trustee, with full amounts permitted under 11 U.S.C. § 326(a), to represent the reasonable and necessary fees allowable as a commission to the Chapter 7 Trustee.

Applicant is allowed, and the Chapter 7 Trustee is authorized to pay, the following amounts as compensation to this professional in this case:

Fees	\$17,747.03
Costs and Expenses	\$225.61

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 Allowance of Fees and Expenses filed by Name of Trustee, the Chapter 7 Trustee, ("Applicant") having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Michael D. McGranahan is allowed the following fees and expenses as trustee of the Estate:

Michael D. McGranahan, the Chapter 7 Trustee

Fees in the amount of \$17,747.03
Expenses in the amount of \$225.61,

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Chapter 7 Trustee is authorized to pay the fees allowed by this Order from the available funds of the Estate in a manner consistent with the order of distribution in a Chapter 7 case.

Tentative Ruling: Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(C).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion—Hearing Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 7 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on August 2, 2022. By the court's calculation, 23 days' notice was provided. 21 days' notice is required. FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002(a)(6) (requiring twenty-one days' notice when requested fees exceed \$1,000.00).

The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Debtor, creditors, the Chapter 7 Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offer opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing, unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. At the hearing, -----

-----.

<p>The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees is granted.</p>

Steven S. Altman, the Attorney("Applicant") for Michael D. McGranahan, the Chapter 7 Trustee ("Client"), makes a First and Final Request for the Allowance of Fees and Expenses in this case.

Fees are requested for the period June 10, 2020, through August 25, 2022. The order of the court approving employment of Applicant was entered on June 26, 2020. Dckt. 21. Applicant requests fees in the amount of \$50,418.00 and costs in the amount of \$1,252.86.

APPLICABLE LAW

Reasonable Fees

A bankruptcy court determines whether requested fees are reasonable by examining the circumstances of the attorney's services, the manner in which services were performed, and the results of the services, by asking:

- A. Were the services authorized?
- B. Were the services necessary or beneficial to the administration of the estate at the time they were rendered?
- C. Are the services documented adequately?
- D. Are the required fees reasonable given the factors in 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(3)?
- E. Did the attorney exercise reasonable billing judgment?

In re Garcia, 335 B.R. at 724 (citing *In re Mednet*, 251 B.R. at 108; *Leichty v. Neary (In re Strand)*, 375 F.3d 854, 860 (9th Cir. 2004)).

Lodestar Analysis

For bankruptcy cases in the Ninth Circuit, “the primary method” to determine whether a fee is reasonable is by using the lodestar analysis. *Marguiles Law Firm, APLC v. Placide (In re Placide)*, 459 B.R. 64, 73 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2011) (citing *Yermakov v. Fitzsimmons (In re Yermakov)*, 718 F.2d 1465, 1471 (9th Cir. 1983)). The lodestar analysis involves “multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended by a reasonable hourly rate.” *Id.* (citing *In re Yermakov*, 718 F.2d at 1471). Both the Ninth Circuit and the Bankruptcy Appellate Panel have stated that departure from the lodestar analysis can be appropriate, however. *See id.* (citing *Unsecured Creditors’ Comm. v. Puget Sound Plywood, Inc. (In re Puget Sound Plywood)*, 924 F.2d 955, 960, 961 (9th Cir. 1991) (holding that the lodestar analysis is not mandated in all cases, thus allowing a court to employ alternative approaches when appropriate); *Digesti & Peck v. Kitchen Factors, Inc. (In re Kitchen Factors, Inc.)*, 143 B.R. 560, 562 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1992) (stating that lodestar analysis is the primary method, but it is not the exclusive method)).

Reasonable Billing Judgment

Even if the court finds that the services billed by an attorney are “actual,” meaning that the fee application reflects time entries properly charged for services, the attorney must demonstrate still that the work performed was necessary and reasonable. *In re Puget Sound Plywood*, 924 F.2d at 958. An attorney must exercise good billing judgment with regard to the services provided because the court’s authorization to employ an attorney to work in a bankruptcy case does not give that attorney “free reign to run up a [professional fees and expenses] tab without considering the maximum probable recovery,” as opposed to a possible recovery. *Id.*; *see also Brosio v. Deutsche Bank Nat’l Tr. Co. (In re Brosio)*, 505 B.R. 903, 913 n.7 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2014) (“Billing judgment is mandatory.”). According to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, prior to working on a legal matter, the attorney, or other professional as appropriate, is obligated to consider:

- (a) Is the burden of the probable cost of legal [or other professional] services disproportionately large in relation to the size of the estate and maximum probable recovery?

(b) To what extent will the estate suffer if the services are not rendered?

(c) To what extent may the estate benefit if the services are rendered and what is the likelihood of the disputed issues being resolved successfully?

In re Puget Sound Plywood, 924 F.2d at 958–59 (citing *In re Wildman*, 72 B.R. 700, 707 (N.D. Ill. 1987)).

A review of the application shows that Applicant's services for the Estate include asset analysis, recovery, and disposition, general case administration, fee and employment applications, and litigation. The Estate has \$190,624.22 of unencumbered monies to be administered as of the filing of the application. The court finds the services were beneficial to Client and the Estate and were reasonable.

FEES AND COSTS & EXPENSES REQUESTED

Fees

Applicant provides a task billing analysis and supporting evidence for the services provided, which are described in the following main categories.

General Case Administration: Applicant spent 9.40 hours in this category. Applicant corresponded with various parties regarding the effective administration of the case.

Asset Analysis and Recovery: Applicant spent hours 18.10 in this category. Applicant corresponded with parties, reviewed applicable law, researched Debtor's case and supporting case documents regarding property of Debtor.

Asset Disposition: Applicant spent 24.70 hours in this category. Applicant reviewed Debtor's case regarding Curtis Street property, reviewed terms of sale of the property, litigated a Motion for Sale, and assisted with the closing of escrow and remittance of net sale proceeds.

Claims Administration and Objection: Applicant spent 44.40 hours in this category. Applicant reviewed Debtor's case and corresponded with various creditors regarding their claims. Numerous correspondence with taxing authorities regarding their claims and litigating motions to approve compromise.

Fee & Employment Applications: Applicant spent 5.90 hours in this category.

Litigation: Applicant spent 64.0 hours in this category. Applicant litigated *McGranahan v. Engle, et al*, Adv No. 21-09007 in a matter with the Internal Revenue Service and Franchise Tax Board regarding determining the extent the liens are avoidable by the Trustee.

Schedules: Applicant spent 0.30 hours in this category. Applicant reviewed Debtors' schedules and exemptions.

Miscellaneous: Applicant's Paralegal spent 4.20 hours in this category.

The fees requested are computed by Applicant by multiplying the time expended providing the services multiplied by an hourly billing rate. The persons providing the services, the time for which compensation is requested, and the hourly rates are:

Names of Professionals and Experience	Time	Hourly Rate	Total Fees Computed Based on Time and Hourly Rate
Steven Altman, Attorney with 45 yrs experience	166.80	\$300.00	\$50,040.00
Dawn Darwin, Paralegal	4.20	\$90.00	<u>\$378.00</u>
Total Fees for Period of Application			\$50,418.00

Costs & Expenses

Applicant also seeks the allowance and recovery of costs and expenses in the amount of \$858.86 pursuant to this application.

The costs requested in this Application are,

Description of Cost	Cost
Copy charges	\$16.53
Postage	\$231.83
Filing Fees	\$538.00
CourtCall	\$45.00
Certification Fee for Order to Sell Real Estate	\$27.50
Total Costs Requested in Application	\$858.86

Attempting to Recover Inappropriate Costs - CourtCall

Applicant is expected as part of its hourly rate to have the necessary and proper office and business support to provide these professional services to Client. These basic resources include, but are not limited to, basic legal research (such as online access to bankruptcy and state laws and cases); phone, email, and facsimile; and secretarial support. The costs requested by Applicant include CourtCall.

While Applicant requested reimbursement for costs associated with making telephonic CourtCall Appearances, the court does not permit such reimbursements and therefore declines to award Applicant CourtCall costs. The decision to attend hearings via CourtCall is at the cost of the attorney included in the hourly rate for the services.

Here, Applicant could have appeared in person, but probably recognized how even with the associated costs it is more economically efficient to attend remotely. CourtCall is a very effective tool allowing attorneys to market their legal skills (and generate fees from a much larger client base).

Therefore, Applicant is only entitled to receive costs in the amount of \$813.86.

FEES AND COSTS & EXPENSES ALLOWED

Fees

Hourly Fees

The court finds that the hourly rates are reasonable and that Applicant effectively used appropriate rates for the services provided. First and Final Fees in the amount of \$50,418.00 are approved pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330 and authorized to be paid by the Chapter 7 Trustee from the available funds of the Estate in a manner consistent with the order of distribution in a Chapter 7 case.

Costs & Expenses

First and Final Costs in the amount of \$813.86 are approved pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330 and authorized to be paid by the Chapter 7 Trustee from the available funds of the Estate in a manner consistent with the order of distribution in a Chapter 7 case.

The court authorizes the Chapter 7 Trustee to pay 100% of the fees and 100% of the costs allowed by the court.

Applicant is allowed, and the Chapter 7 Trustee is authorized to pay, the following amounts as compensation to this professional in this case:

Fees	\$50,418.00
Costs and Expenses	\$813.86

pursuant to this Application as final fees and costs pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330 in this case.

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 Allowance of Fees and Expenses filed by Steven S. Altman, the Attorney("Applicant") for Michael D. McGranahan, the Chapter 7 Trustee ("Client"), having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Steven S. Altman is allowed the following fees and expenses as a professional of the Estate:

Steven S. Altman, Professional employed by the Chapter 7 Trustee

Fees in the amount of \$50,418.00

Expenses in the amount of \$813.86

as the final allowance of fees and expenses pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330 as counsel for the Chapter 7 Trustee.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Chapter 7 Trustee is authorized to pay 100% of the fees and 100% of the costs allowed by this Order from the available funds of the Estate in a manner consistent with the order of distribution in a Chapter 7 case.

3. [22-90194-E-7](#)
[SSH-1](#)

LINDA PORTER
Simran Hundal

**MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF UNION
ADJUSTMENT CO., INC.**
7-19-22 [15]

Tentative Ruling: Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

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

Sufficient Notice Not Provided. No Proof of Service has been filed. At the hearing, **XXXXXXXXXXXX**

~~The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 7 Trustee, Creditor, creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on **xxxx, 2022**. By the court's calculation, **xx** days' notice was provided. 28 days' notice is required.~~

~~----- The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien 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 to Avoid Judicial Lien is granted.
--

This Motion requests an order avoiding the judicial lien of Union Adjustment Co., Inc. (“Creditor”) against property of the debtor, Linda Eileen Porter (“Debtor”) commonly known as 19198 Fallen Leaf Lane, Twaine Harte, California (“Property”).

A judgment was entered against Debtor in favor of Creditor on April 26, 2007. Exhibit C, Dckt. 17. An abstract of judgment was recorded with Tuolumne County on August 10, 2021, that encumbers the Property. *Id.*

Pursuant to Debtor’s Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$261,790.00 as of the petition date. Dckt. 14. The unavoidable consensual liens that total \$150,960.05 as of the commencement of this case are stated on Debtor’s Schedule D. Dckt. 14. Debtor has claimed an exemption pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 704.730(a) in the amount of \$300,000.00 on Schedule C. Dckt. 14.

After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A), there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of the judicial lien impairs Debtor’s exemption of the real property, and its fixing is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

ISSUANCE OF A COURT-DRAFTED ORDER

An order substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

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

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by Linda Eileen Porter (“Debtor”) 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 judgment lien of 19198 Fallen Leaf Lane, Twaine Harte, California Superior Court for Tuolumne County Case No. CVL52629, recorded on August 10, 2021, Document No. 2021012267, with the Tuolumne County Recorder, against the real property commonly known as 19198 Fallen Leaf Lane, Twaine Harte, California, is avoided in its entirety pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.