UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher D. Jaime
Chief Bankruptcy Judge
Department B, Courtroom 32
501 I Street, 6th Floor
Sacramento, California

September 1, 2026 at 1:00 p.m.

Unless otherwise ordered, all matters before the Honorable Chief **Christopher Jaime** shall be simultaneously: (1) **In Person** at, **Sacramento Courtroom No. 32, 6th Floor** (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/RemoteAppearances. 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 medica 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.

PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS INSTRUCTIONS:

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. 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 <u>no hearing on these matters and no appearance is necessary</u>. 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 seven (7) days of the final hearing on the matter.

1.	25-24105-B-13 PLG-1	PRISCILLA ORTEGA Rabin Pournazarian	MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN 7-28-26 [32]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days' notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). Non-opposition was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to permit the requested modification and confirm the modified plan.

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. The Debtor has filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329, and is confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes. An appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 plan shall be prepared consistent with the current practice of the Chapter 13 Trustee assigned to the case and the proposed order shall be submitted to the court.

The court will issue an order.

2. 26-21914-B-13 PGM-2 RAZEL RAVELO Peter G. Macaluso MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN 7-16-26 [41]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. *See* Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to not confirm the first amended plan.

Debtor must provide documentation of the retirement loan referenced in Schedule I and payment advices from employer Dignity Health for the period of March 15, 2026, through March 31, 2025. Without this information, Debtor's income cannot be verified.

The amended plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1323, and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

3. 25-21517-B-13 ERIKA BOUIE MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
MJD-3 Matthew J. DeCaminada 7-26-26 [67]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days' notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. *See* Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to not permit the requested modification and not confirm the modified plan.

The plan will take approximately 66 months to complete, which exceeds the maximum length of 60 months pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1322 (d) and which results in a commitment period that exceeds the permissible limit imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b)(4). The overextension is due to Debtor's prior delinquency and, as a result, the Chapter 13 Trustee did not have enough funds to disburse the post-petition mortgage payments to creditor First Tech Federal Credit Union. The modified plan does not provide for a cure for these payments, thus causing the plan to be overextended as it is not properly funded. Debtor would need to increase her plan payment to approximately $4,525.00 a month starting August 2026 and lasting through the end of the plan in order to complete in 60 months. However, according to the Debtor's Amended Schedule I and J, Debtor does not have the monthly net disposable income to increase the plan payment.

The modified plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

4. 24-21118-B-13 JOHN CAMPOS — MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
JRB-2 Mark A. Wolff — 6-16-26 [94]

J.A. VS.

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion for relief from automatic stay.

J.A. ("Movant") seeks to terminate the automatic stay as to Civil Defendant and Debtor John S. Campos solely to allow Movant to proceed with the civil action titled J.A. v. Aerosports Trampoline Parks LLC, et al., in the Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, only against the non-debtor defendants Ryan O'Brien, Cary O'Brien, Angela O'Brien, and Aerosports Trampoline Parks LLC. The motion does not seek any recovery from the Debtor, John S. Campos, or the bankruptcy estate and will not interfere with the Debtor's confirmed Chapter 13 plan. The moving party has provided the Declaration of John R. Byerly to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by the Debtor.

The bankruptcy court may grant relief from stay for cause when it is necessary to allow litigation in a nonbankruptcy court. 3 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 362.07[3][a] (Alan N. Resnick & Henry J. Sommer eds. 16th ed.). The basis for such relief to litigate in another forum is predicated on factors of judicial economy. *See Truebro, Inc. v. Plumberex Specialty Products, Inc. (In re Plumberex Specialty Products, Inc.)*, 311 B.R. 551, 556-557. (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2004). Moreover, "[t]he validity of [a] claim or contract underlying the claim is not litigated during the [stay relief] hearing." *Johnson v. Righetti (In re Johnson)*, 756 F.2d 738, 740 (9th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 828 (1985).

The court finds that the nature of the State Court Litigation warrants relief from stay for cause. The state court litigation does not impact creditors since Movant does not seek any recovery from Debtor or the bankruptcy estate. *See* dkt. 124.

The court shall issue an order modifying the automatic stay as it applies to the Debtor to allow the Movant to continue the State Court Litigation.

The automatic stay is not modified with respect to the enforcement of any judgment against the Debtor, Trustee, or property of the bankruptcy estate. Any judgment obtained that affects Debtor shall be brought back to this court for the proper treatment of any claims under the Bankruptcy Code.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

5.	25-27018-B-13 SSH-2	CAROLINE SANDERS Simran Singh Hundal	MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN 7-13-26 [41]

Final Ruling

The Chapter 13 Trustee having filed a notice of withdrawal of its objection, the objection is dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041. The matter is removed from the calendar.

There being no other objection to confirmation, the plan filed July 13, 2026, will be confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes. An appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 plan shall be prepared consistent with the current practice of the Chapter 13 Trustee assigned to the case and the proposed order shall be submitted to the court.

The court will issue an order.

6. 25-25324-B-13 TLA-1 | COLTON/ELIZABETH HEPPE Thomas L. Amberg | OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF PATELCO CREDIT UNION, CLAIM NUMBER 15 7-15-26 [23]

Final Ruling

The objection has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(b)(1). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 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). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to sustain the objection to Claim No. 15 of Patelco Credit Union and disallow the claim in its entirety.

Debtors request that the court disallow the claim of Patelco Credit Union ("Creditor"), Claim No. 15. The claim is asserted to be in the amount of $31,915.98. The Debtors assert that the claim has not been timely filed. *See* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002(c). The deadline for filing proofs of claim in this case for a non-government unit was December 8, 2025. The Creditor's claim was filed July 1, 2026.

Section 501(a) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that any creditor may file a proof of claim. "A proof of claim is a written statement setting forth a creditor's claim." Rule 3001(a). If the claim meets the requirements of § 501, the bankruptcy court must then determine whether the claim should be allowed. Section 502(a) provides that a claim is deemed allowed unless a party in interest objects. If such an objection is made, the court shall allow such claim "except to the extent that the proof of claim is not timely filed." *See* 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(9).

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3002(c) governs the time for filing proofs of claim in a Chapter 13 case. Rule 9006(b)(3) prohibits the enlargement of time to file a proof of claim under Rule 3002(c) except as provided in one of the circumstances included in Rule 3002(c). *Zidell, Inc. v. Forsch (In re Coastal Alaska Lines, Inc.)*, 920 F.2d 1428, 1432-1433 (9th Cir. 1990) ("We . . . hold that the bankruptcy court cannot enlarge the time for filing a proof of claim unless one of the six situations listed in Rule 3002(c) exists."). No showing has been made that any of those circumstances apply.

The court also notes that the excusable neglect standard does not apply to permit the court to extend the time to file a proof of claim under Rule 3002(c). As the Ninth Circuit stated in *Coastal Alaska*:

> Rule 9006(b) plainly allows an extension of the 90-day time limit established by Rule 3002(c) only under the conditions permitted by Rule 3002(c). Rule 3002(c) identifies six circumstances where a late filing is allowed, and excusable neglect is not among them. Thus, the 90-day deadline for filing claims under Rule 3002(c) cannot be extended for excusable neglect.

Id. at 1432. In fact, the time for filing claims under Rule 3002(c) cannot be extended for any equitable reason at all. As stated in *Spokane Law Enforcement Credit Union v. Barker (In re Barker)*, 839 F.3d 1189, 1197 (9th Cir. 2016): "[T]he Ninth Circuit has repeatedly held that the deadline to file a proof of claim in a Chapter 13 proceeding is 'rigid' and the bankruptcy court lacks equitable power to extend this deadline after the fact."

In sum, Creditor filed an untimely proof of claim and has not demonstrated any reason that would permit the court to allow its late-filed proof of claim.

Based on the evidence before the court, the Creditor's claim is disallowed in its entirety as untimely. The objection to the proof of claim is sustained.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

7.	26-23425-B-13 LGT-1	MARKELLA RAINE Mark A. Wolff	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 7-31-26 [14]

CONTINUED TO 9/22/26 AT 1:00 P.M. PER STIPULATION BETWEEN DEBTOR AND CHAPTER 13 TRUSTEE.

Final Ruling

No appearance at the September 1, 2026, hearing is required. The court will issue an order.

8. 26-23427-B-13 SHELISA TURNER — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY PRIVATE MONEY LENDING, INC.
JB-1 Peter G. Macaluso — 8-5-26 [20]
Thru #9

Final Ruling

The objection was properly filed at least 14 days prior to the hearing on the motion to confirm a plan. *See* Local Bankr. R. 3015-1(c)(4) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(2). Parties in interest may, at least 7 days prior to the date of the hearing, serve and file with the court a written reply to any written opposition. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(f)(1)(C). Debtor filed a written reply stating that the objection should be sustained.

Therefore, the objection to confirmation will be sustained. The plan filed June 26, 2026, does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The plan is not confirmed.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

9. 26-23427-B-13 SHELISA TURNER — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
LGT-1 Peter G. Macaluso — 7-31-26 [17]

Final Ruling

The objection was properly filed at least 14 days prior to the hearing on the motion to confirm a plan. *See* Local Bankr. R. 3015-1(c)(4) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(2). Parties in interest may, at least 7 days prior to the date of the hearing, serve and file with the court a written reply to any written opposition. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(f)(1)(C). Debtor filed a written reply stating that the objection should be sustained.

Therefore, the objection to confirmation will be sustained. The plan filed June 26, 2026, does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The plan is not confirmed.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

10. 26-21629-B-13 DK-2 | JOSE GONZALEZ MENDOZA AND JANISA BENAVIDES CORDOBAS Daniel King | MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN 7-30-26 [39]

Final Ruling

The motion to confirm amended plan was not set for hearing on the 35-days notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Only 33 days' notice was given. Therefore, the motion is denied without prejudice.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

11. 26-24430-B-13 DARDEN TYRONE MOTION TO IMPOSE AUTOMATIC STAY
DDR-1 Daniel D. Repp 8-18-26 [27]

Tentative Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on less than 28-days notice. Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition and may appear at the hearing to offer oral argument.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to impose automatic stay.

Debtor seeks to have the provisions of the automatic stay provided by 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(4)(B) imposed in this case. This is the Debtor's third bankruptcy petition pending in the past 12 months. The Debtor's first bankruptcy case was dismissed on November 3, 2025, for failure to timely file documents (case no. 25-25643, dkt. 13). The Debtor's second bankruptcy case was dismissed on July 1, 2026, for failure to file an amended plan and delinquency of plan payments (case no. 25-26363).

Discussion

Section 362(c)(4)(A) provides that if a case is filed by an individual debtor, and if two or more cases of the debtor were pending within the previous year but were dismissed, other than a case refiled after dismissal of a case under § 707(b), the automatic stay does not go into effect upon the filing of the new case. However, § 362(c)(4)(B) provides that on request made within 30 days after the filing of the new case, the court may order the stay to take effect if the moving party demonstrates that the filing of the new case is in good faith as to the creditors to be stayed.

The subsequently filed case is presumed to be filed in bad faith if: (I) 2 or more previous bankruptcy cases were pending within the 1-year period; (II) a previous case was dismissed after the debtor failed to file or amend the petition or other documents as required without substantial excuse, failed to provide adequate protection as ordered by the court, or failed to perform the terms of a plan confirmed by the court; or (III) there has not been a substantial change in the financial or personal affairs of the debtor since the dismissal of the next previous case. *Id.* at § 362(c)(4)(D). The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. *Id.*

Debtor states that he failed to make plan payments in the prior bankruptcy due to loss of income. His first trucking job did not have a truck for him to drive, and the second trucking job engaged in unfair business practices that resulted in Debtor owing the company money despite Debtor averaging 70 hours per week. In this case, Debtors circumstances have changed because he has obtained employment through California's In-Home Support Services program, his non-filing wife is building up her room and board business, and Debtor is also pursuing short-range trucking to supplement income. Debtor's Schedules I and J reflect a joint net surplus income.

The Debtor has offered sufficient explanation from which the court can conclude that his financial or personal circumstances have substantially changed, and that the present case will be concluded with a confirmed plan that will be fully performed. The Debtor has shown by clear and convincing evidence that this case has been filed in good faith within the meaning of § 362(c)(4)(D).

The motion is granted and the automatic stay is imposed for all purposes and parties.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

12. 26-23431-B-13 TABITHA JONES OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
LGT-1 Pro Se PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
8-3-26 [13]

Final Ruling

The objection to confirmation was properly filed at least 14 days prior to the hearing on the motion to confirm a plan. *See* Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(4) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(2). Nonetheless, the court determines that the resolution of this matter does not require oral argument. *See* Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h).

The court's decision is to overrule the objection as moot.

Subsequent to the Chapter 13 Trustee filing its objection, Debtors filed an amended plan on August 28, 2026. The confirmation hearing for the amended plan must still be scheduled. Nonetheless, the earlier plan filed June 16, 2026, is not confirmed.

The objection is ORDERED OVERRULED AS MOOT for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

13. 21-23539-B-13 PGM-8 | DEREK WOLF Peter G. Macaluso | MOTION BY PETER G. MACALUSO TO WITHDRAW AS ATTORNEY 7-31-26 [421]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to withdraw as attorney.

Peter G. Macaluso ("Counsel"), attorney for Debtor, moves to withdraw as attorney due to Debtor's expressed lack of confidence in counsel and who has stated he will not meet with Counsel to further the case.

Local Bankr. R. 2017-1(e) provides that an attorney who has appeared may not withdraw leaving the client in propria persona without leave of the court upon noticed motion and notice to the client and all other parties who have appeared. The attorney shall provide an affidavit stating the current or last known address or addresses of the client and the efforts made to notify the client of the motion to withdraw. Withdrawal of an attorney is governed by the Rules of Professional Conduct of the State Bar of California and Counsel shall conform to the requirements of those rules.

Pursuant to California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16, formerly California Rule of Professional Conduct 3-700, a lawyer may withdraw from representing a client if the client breaches a material term of an agreement with the lawyer and the lawyer has given the client reasonable warning of withdrawal, if a continuation of the representation is likely to result in a violation of the rules, if the client renders it unreasonably difficult for the lawyer to carry out the representation effectively, or if other good cause for withdrawal exists. Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct 1.16(b).

Debtor is in month 57 of a 60-month plan but remains delinquent in plan payments. Counsel states that communication has broken down, become adversarial, and Debtor is unwilling to follow the advice of Counsel going forward in this case, making legal representation ineffective. This is cause for permitting the Counsel's withdrawal pursuant to California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16.

The court will permit the Counsel's withdrawal from this bankruptcy case. The motion will be granted. Counsel shall mail Debtor his case file within seven (7) days of the hearing on this motion, at the last known address of Debtor.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

14.	26-23339-B-13 LGT-1	ALMA RIVERA AND RAMON ROSALES Seth L. Hanson	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 7-30-26 [14]

Final Ruling

The objection to confirmation was properly filed at least 14 days prior to the hearing on the motion to confirm a plan. *See* Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(4) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(2). Nonetheless, the court determines that the resolution of this matter does not require oral argument. *See* Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h).

The court's decision is to overrule the objection as moot.

Subsequent to the Chapter 13 Trustee filing its objection, Debtors filed an amended plan on August 25, 2026. The confirmation hearing for the amended plan is scheduled for October 13, 2026. The earlier plan filed June 10, 2026, is not confirmed.

The objection is ORDERED OVERRULED AS MOOT for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

15. 26-23440-B-13 LGT-1 **Thru #16** | MATTHEW/KIMBRA CHAPMAN Natali A. Ron | OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 8-4-26 [14]

Final Ruling

The Chapter 13 Trustee ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the Plan Debtors Matthew and Kimbra Chapman ("Debtors") filed June 16, 2026. Dkt. 3. Debtors filed a response.

The court has reviewed the plan, objection, and response. The court has also reviewed and takes judicial notice of the docket. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 201(c)(1). Oral argument is not necessary and will not assist in the decision-making process. *See* Local Bankr. R. 1001-1(f), 9014-1(h).

The plan is not confirmable, at a minimum, due to the denied motion to value collateral of U.S. Bank National Association, NAR-1, Item #16. The value of that collateral will impact monthly plan payments. Debtors are also delinquent $1,392.20 with an additional payment of $2,785.00 due August 25, 2026. Revisions must be addressed in an amended plan and not any order confirming.

Separately, another issue relates to a Peterbilt commercial truck ("Vehicle") that Debtors sold in April 2026 for $68,000 and transferred to their corporation, Chapman Trucking, Inc. ("Corporation"), on April 10, 2026. The Trustee objects to confirmation on the basis that 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4) is not satisfied. More precisely, the Trustee avers that in a hypothetical Chapter 7, the fraudulent transfer would be recoverable by the Trustee for the benefit of the estate and its creditors. The fraudulent transfer must be factored into the liquidation analysis for the best interest of creditors.

Debtors filed a response stating that there was no fraudulent transfer because the Vehicle was used and operated by the Corporation. The Corporation paid insurance premiums, maintenance and repair expenses, fuel expenses, and maintained a Commercial Auto insurance policy on the Vehicle. The Vehicle was also claimed on the Corporation's tax returns and depreciation schedules each year. Debtors state that they were legal owners while the Corporation was the holder of equitable ownership. Accordingly, the sale of the Vehicle was not the sale of a personal asset and, instead, was the sale of a business asset which Debtors held legal title to. Debtors contend there transfer of the sale proceeds to the Corporation was not fraudulent.

If Debtors contend the Vehicle - and thence the sale proceeds - are corporate assets that have no bearing on plan confirmation, then it is incumbent on Debtors, as the plan proponents, to demonstrate that § 1325(a)(4) is satisfied or otherwise inapplicable. However, a plan confirmation hearing is not the context in which the dispute is appropriately resolved. Absent some sort of agreed-upon resolution, an adversary proceeding may be necessary. *See* Fed. R. Bank. 7001(b) (proceeding to determine validity, priority, or extent of interest in property). But for present purposes, the dispute is enough to preclude confirmation on a separate and independent basis.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for the reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

16. 26-23440-B-13 NAR-1 | MATTHEW/KIMBRA CHAPMAN Natali A. Ron | MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION 8-19-26 [23]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). However, there appears to be insufficient service of process on U.S.

Bank National Association, which holds a security interest in a 2019 Highland Ridge. The address used by the Debtors is for credit cards and personal lines of credit and not for vehicle loans according to usbank.com. The address used by the Debtors also does not correspond with the address that notices to the creditor should be sent according to Claim No. 8-1.

Finally, U.S. Bank National Association is an insured depository institution. Absent circumstances not applicable here, service of the motion and its related documents on U.S. Bank National Association as an insured depository institution is governed by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(h) which requires service by "certified mail addressed to an officer of the institution[.]". Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(h).

Debtors complied with neither requirement according to the certificate of service filed with the motion. Dkt. 26.

Therefore, the court's decision is to deny the motion without prejudice.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

17. 26-23541-B-13 MARC/PATRICIA HILLMAN OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
JCW-1 Gregory J. Smith PLAN BY CAPITAL ONE AUTO
Thru #18 FINANCE
7-31-26 [30]

Final Ruling

The objection was properly filed at least 14 days prior to the hearing on the motion to confirm a plan. *See* Local Bankr. R. 3015-1(c)(4) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(2). Parties in interest may, at least 7 days prior to the date of the hearing, serve and file with the court a written reply to any written opposition. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(f)(1)(C). A written reply has been filed to the objection.

All objections have been resolved and the court has determined that oral argument is not necessary. *See* Local Bankr. R. 1001-1(f), 9014-1(h). This matter will be decided on the papers. No appearance at the hearing is necessary.

The court's decision is to overrule the objection and confirm the plan.

Creditor Capital One Auto Finance objects to confirmation of the plan on grounds that it attempts to inappropriately cramdown the value of a 2020 GMC Acadia Utility 4D AT4 AWD 3.6L V6 when the vehicle was purchased within 910 days preceding the filing date of the petition, and it provides for an interest of only 5.00%. Creditor states that it filed Claim No. 2-1 that reflects a total secured claim of $38,434.57 with an interest rate of 11.85%. Creditor states that it will not accept an interest rate that is less than the prime interest rate of 6.750% plus at least 2.00% as adjusted for the greater risk of default posed by a debtor.

Debtors filed a response stating that they are agreeable to providing for the $38,434.57 claim at an interest rate of 8.75% in the order confirming plan.

Given the aforementioned, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is overruled and the plan filed June 22, 2026, is confirmed.

The objection is ORDERED OVERRULED for reasons stated in the minutes.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plan is CONFIRMED for reasons stated in the minutes. An appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 plan shall be prepared consistent with the current practice of the Chapter 13 Trustee assigned to the case and the proposed order shall be submitted to the court.

The court will issue an order.

18. 26-23541-B-13 MARC/PATRICIA HILLMAN OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
LGT-1 Gregory J. Smith PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
8-3-26 [27]

Final Ruling

The objection was properly filed at least 14 days prior to the hearing on the motion to confirm a plan. *See* Local Bankr. R. 3015-1(c)(4) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(2). Parties in interest may, at least 7 days prior to the date of the hearing, serve and file with the court a written reply to any written opposition. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(f)(1)(C). Written replies and responses have been filed to the objection.

All objections have been resolved and the court has determined that oral argument is not necessary. *See* Local Bankr. R. 1001-1(f), 9014-1(h). This matter will be decided on the papers. No appearance at the hearing is necessary.

The court's decision is to overrule the objection and confirm the plan.

The Chapter 13 Trustee objects to confirmation of the plan for reasons raised by creditor Capital One Auto Finance ("Creditor"), JCW-1, Item #17, which Debtors agree to resolve. This requires Creditor's claim to be properly classified in Class 2 Section A rather than Class 2 Section B. This can be addressed in the order confirming.

The order confirming will additionally provide the following language: The monthly attorney's fees dividend shall be $731 per month for months 1 through 5, and then $97.18 per month for months 6 through 60.

Given the aforementioned, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is overruled and the plan filed June 22, 2026, is confirmed.

The objection is ORDERED OVERRULED for reasons stated in the minutes.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plan is CONFIRMED for reasons stated in the minutes. An appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 plan shall be prepared consistent with the current practice of the Chapter 13 Trustee assigned to the case and the proposed order shall be submitted to the court.

The court will issue an order.

19. 26-21244-B-13 JUSTIN FORD MOTION TO SET ASIDE DISMISSAL
NAR-1 Natali A. Ron OF CASE
8-7-26 [82]

DEBTOR DISMISSED: 07/29/26

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on less than 28-days notice. Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. *See* Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to **conditionally grant the motion to set aside dismissal and continue the matter to September 8, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.**

Debtor moves to vacate the order dismissing this Chapter 13 case. The Chapter 13 case was dismissed on July 29, 2026, for failure to file a new plan, failure to provide requested documents to the Chapter 13 Trustee, and delinquency of plan payments. Dkt. 78. Debtor states that at the time of dismissal, Debtor and his counsel were preparing to file an amended Chapter 13 plan and gathering documents to provide the Chapter 13 Trustee. Counsel anticipated filing everything on time but due to Counsel's caseload, loss of three staff members in Counsel's firm, and personal family matters, Counsel was unable to timely finalize the proposed plan and collect all requested documents. Since the time the case was dismissed, Debtor and Counsel have provided the Trustee with all documents and are nearly done finalizing the amended plan.

The Trustee filed a non-opposition to the motion but requests that a refund check that was mailed to the Debtor be returned to the Trustee. Debtor has agreed to this in his response.

Discussion

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1), applicable by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9024, permits the court to relieve a party from a final judgment or order for "mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect[.]" Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1); Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9024. Relief for excusable neglect is governed by the *Pioneer-Briones* factors, *i.e.*, (1) the danger of prejudice to any non-moving party if the dismissal is vacated; (2) the length of delay and the potential impact of that delay on judicial proceeding; (3) the reason for the delay, including whether the delay was within the reasonable control of the movant; and (4) whether the debtor's conduct was in good faith. *Pioneer Inv. Servs. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. P'ship*, 507 U.S. 380, 395 (1993); *Briones v. Riviera Hotel & Casino*, 116 F.3d 379, 381 (9th Cir. 1997).

Danger of prejudice to creditors is minimal. Debtor moved within days after this case was dismissed to set aside the dismissal order. Vacating dismissal will not delay these proceedings since the Debtor has already provided the Trustee with requested documents and will file an amended plan. Dismissal also resulted from an oversight by Counsel and not Debtor. And there is no indication of any bad faith by the Debtor.

Therefore, the Debtor's motion to vacate the order dismissing this Chapter 13 case will be granted, the dismissal order at dkt. 80 vacated, and this case ordered reinstated.

Further, by vacating the dismissal order which caused the automatic stay of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) to terminate, upon entry of the order vacating the dismissal order, the automatic stay of § 362(a) is revived for all purposes and as to all parties in interest - but only upon entry of the order vacating the dismissal order and for acts occurring thereafter. *State Bank of Southern Utah v. Gledhill (In re Gledhill)*, 76 F.3d 1070, 1079-1080 and n.8 (10th Cir. 1996); *Ramirez v. Whelen (In re Ramirez)*, 188 B.R. 413, 416 (9th Cir. BAP 1995) ("Occasionally, it might suffice to revive the stay by way of motion for reconsideration under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) or

60(b), which are applicable in bankruptcy by virtue of Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9021 and 9023 [sic].") (Klein, J., concurring).

Conditional Nature of this Ruling

Because the motion has been filed, set, and served under Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2), any party in interest shall have until 5:00 p.m. on Friday, September 4, 2026, to file and serve an opposition or other response to the motion. *See* Local Bankr. R. 3007-1(b)(2). Any opposition or response shall be served on the Chapter 13 Trustee and creditor by facsimile or email.

If no opposition or response is timely filed and served, the motion will be deemed granted for the reasons stated hereinabove, this ruling will no longer be conditional and will become the court's final decision, and the continued hearing on September 8, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. will be vacated.

If an opposition or response is timely filed and served, the court will hear the motion on September 8, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

The motion is ORDERED CONDITIONALLY GRANTED and CONTINUED to September 8, 2026 at 1:00 p.m. for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

20. 24-22948-B-13 GENE/YVONNE TAGUE MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
KLG-2 Arete Kostopoulos 7-14-26 [36]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days' notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. *See* Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to not permit the requested modification and not confirm the modified plan.

First, Debtors must provide amended Schedule I to reflect both Debtors' current employment and income information. Without this, it is unclear whether Debtors will be able to make all payments under the plan and comply with the plan. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

Second, the plan fails to cure the delinquent post-petition ongoing mortgage payments owed to Lakeview Loan Servicing, LLC for the months of March 2026 through July 2026.

Third, the plan proposes to pay a monthly dividend of $115.00 per month toward attorney fees for the remaining balance of $4,715.00. It would take 41 months to pay the balance of attorney fees in full at the proposed dividend, and there are 36 months left to pay in the modified Plan. In order to pay the attorney fees in full within 36 months, a dividend of $130.98 would be necessary.

The modified plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

21. 26-23350-B-13 LEE VANG
LGT-1 Matthew J. DeCaminada

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
8-3-26 [13]

Final Ruling

The *initial* Chapter 13 Plan filed June 10, 2026, is not confirmable and the objection is not one that may be resolved in the confirmation order. Nevertheless, because this is the *initial* Chapter 13 Plan, the procedure in Local Bankr. R. 3015-1(c)(4) applies.

The court's decision is to **continue the hearing to September 8, 2026, at 1:00 p.m., conditionally sustain the objection, and deny confirmation of the plan**.

First, Debtor is delinquent $997.00 and an additional plan payment of the same amount was due on August 25, 2026. Debtor has not made all plan payments and complied with the plan. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

Second, amended Form 122C-1 must be filed to disclose Debtor's accurate monthly income amount.

Third, amended Disclosure of Compensation Form must be filed to reflect that Debtor's counsel will represent Debtor in contested bankruptcy matters.

The plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the plan is not confirmed.

Conditional Nature of this Ruling

Because the objection has been filed, set, and served under Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(4) and 9014-1(f)(2), any party in interest shall have until 5:00 p.m. on September 4, 2026, to file and serve a response to the objection(s). *See* Local Bankr. R. 3015-1(c)(4), 9014-1(f)(2)(C). Any response shall be served on the Chapter 13 Trustee, the Debtor, the Debtor's attorney, and/or the attorney for the objecting party by facsimile or email.

If no response is timely filed and served, the objection will be deemed sustained for the reasons stated hereinabove, this ruling will no longer be conditional and will become the court's final decision, and the continued hearing on September 8, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. will be vacated.

If a response is timely filed and served, the court will hear the objection on September 8, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

The objection is ORDERED CONDITIONALLY SUSTAINED and CONTINUED to September 8, 2026 at 1:00 p.m. for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

22. 26-22456-B-13 THEODORE/WANDA STITT MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
PLG-1 Rabin Pournazarian 7-17-26 [28]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. *See* Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court’s decision is to not confirm the first amended plan.

Debtor must file an amended plan that properly classifies in Section 4.02 the claim of NMAC as an unsecured claim for a leased vehicle.

The amended plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1323, and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

23. 26-20965-B-13 RODRICK HUERTA-MOORE MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
HLG-1 Kristy A. Hernandez 7-11-26 [25]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days' notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to confirm the amended plan.

11 U.S.C. § 1323 permits a debtor to amend a plan any time before confirmation. The Debtor has provided evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the motion has been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The amended plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes. An appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 plan shall be prepared consistent with the current practice of the Chapter 13 Trustee assigned to the case and the proposed order shall be submitted to the court.

The court will issue an order.

24. 25-26970-B-13 WALTER/SHIRLEY SAUNDERS MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
KLG-1 Arete Kostopoulos 7-15-26 [45]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. *See* Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to not confirm the first amended plan.

First, the plan fails to expressly provide for the curing of the post-petition mortgage arrears in the amount of $19,133.82 owed to U.S. Bank N.A.

Second, the plan in appropriately lists a combined total of pre-petition and post-petition mortgage arrears in Section 3.07. Section 3.07 is for the curing of pre-petition 1 arrears, and usually the curing of post-petition mortgage arrears is accomplished in a nonstandard provision.

Third, Debtors are delinquent $5,993.71. An additional payment of the same amount was due August 25, 2026. Debtors have not made all payments under the plan or complied with the plan. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

The amended plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1323, and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

25. 26-23473-B-13 LGT-1	HERB/DAWN KNECHT Joaquin Rene Nolet	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 8-4-26 [14]

CONTINUED TO 10/06/26 AT 1:00 P.M. TO BE HEARD AFTER THE CONTINUED MEETING OF CREDITORS SET FOR 9/24/26.

Final Ruling

No appearance at the September 1, 2026, hearing is required. The court will issue an order.

26.	26-23379-B-13 LGT-1	MARCELO/MYRA CHAPARRO Mohammad M. Mokarram	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 7-30-26 [16]

WITHDRAWN BY M.P.

Final Ruling

The Chapter 13 Trustee having filed a notice of withdrawal of its objection, the objection is dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(I) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041. The matter is removed from the calendar.

There being no other objection to confirmation, the plan filed June 12, 2026, will be confirmed.

The objection is ORDERED DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for reasons stated in the minutes.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plan is CONFIRMED for reasons stated in the minutes. An appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 plan shall be prepared consistent with the current practice of the Chapter 13 Trustee assigned to the case and the proposed order shall be submitted to the court.

The court will issue an order.

27. 25-26481-B-13 ARTHER/ARLENE JACKSON MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
MC-2 Muoi Chea 7-27-26 [40]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days' notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to permit the requested modification and confirm the modified plan.

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. The Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329, and is confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes. An appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 plan shall be prepared consistent with the current practice of the Chapter 13 Trustee assigned to the case and the proposed order shall be submitted to the court.

The court will issue an order.

28. 26-23162-B-13 LGT-1 — MARTHA ZOERB, Ryan Keenan — CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 7-21-26 [15]

Final Ruling

This matter was continued from August 27, 2026, to allow any party in interest to file a response by 5:00 p.m. Friday, August 28, 2026. Nothing was filed. Therefore, the court's conditional ruling at dkt. 22, sustaining the objection, shall become the court's final decision. The continued hearing on September 1, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. is vacated.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for reasons stated in the minutes at dkt. 22.

The court will issue an order.