#### UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT Eastern District of California Honorable René Lastreto II

Hearing Date: Thursday, September 6, 2018
Place: Department B - 510 19th Street
Bakersfield, 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. 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.

#### 9:00 AM

1.  $\frac{18-12004}{MHM-2}$ -B-13 IN RE: HERBERT KELLEY

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 7-25-2018 [34]

MICHAEL MEYER/MV SUSAN SALEHI RESPONSIVE PLEADING

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's

findings and conclusions. The court will issue

the order.

This motion was filed and served pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1) and will proceed as scheduled.

This motion is GRANTED. The trustee's declaration states that the debtor has failed to provide necessary documents to their office. Doc. #36. Debtor filed a timely opposition, stating that they complied with the trustee's request and that some requested documents were not available. Doc. #40. The trustee filed a reply, stating that the provided documents do not accurately provide the information the trustee requested. Doc. #46.

This matter will be called in order for the debtor to respond to the trustee's reply.

### 2. <u>18-11505</u>-B-13 IN RE: MIGUEL GONZALEZ AND ADRIANA MELENDREZ-GONZALEZ

PK-6

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN 8-2-2018 [76]

MIGUEL GONZALEZ/MV PATRICK KAVANAGH

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 35 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 3015-1(d)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. The confirmation order shall include the docket control number of the motion and it shall reference the plan by the date it was filed.

### 3. $\frac{18-12306}{MHM-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: TOMAS SALINAS

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 7-23-2018 [20]

MICHAEL MEYER/MV ROBERT WILLIAMS

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

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion was set for hearing on 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. The trustee's declaration states that the debtor has failed to provide necessary documents to their office and failed to set a plan for hearing with notice to creditors. Debtor did not file any opposition. Therefore, pursuant to LBR 9014- 1(f)(1)(B) and 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1), cause exists to dismiss this case.

4.  $\frac{18-12306}{MHM-2}$ -B-13 IN RE: TOMAS SALINAS

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 8-1-2018 [24]

MICHAEL MEYER/MV ROBERT WILLIAMS

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

DISPOSITION: Denied as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion is DENIED AS MOOT. Trustee's Motion to Dismiss (MHM-1, Matter #3 above) is GRANTED.

# 5. $\frac{18-12218}{MHM-2}$ -B-13 IN RE: WILLIAM HOLLEY

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 7-20-2018 [17]

MICHAEL MEYER/MV NEIL SCHWARTZ

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

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion was set for hearing on 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. The trustee's declaration states that the debtor failed to appear at the § 341 meeting, debtor has failed to provide necessary documents to their office, and is delinquent in the amount of \$2,524.28. Debtor did not file any opposition. Therefore, pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) and 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1) and (c)(4), cause exists to dismiss this case.

# 6. $\frac{17-10622}{PK-6}$ -B-13 IN RE: JENNIFER RIVAS

MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN 8-2-2018 [140]

JENNIFER RIVAS/MV PATRICK KAVANAGH

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 35 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 3015-1(d)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. The confirmation order shall include the docket control number of the motion and it shall reference the plan by the date it was filed.

# 7. $\frac{15-14827}{LKW-4}$ -B-13 IN RE: BRIAN HOVEN

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION BY THE LAW OFFICE OF LEONARD K. WELSH FOR LEONARD K. WELSH, DEBTORS ATTORNEY(S) 8-10-2018 [78]

LEONARD WELSH

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's

findings and conclusions. The Moving Party will submit a proposed order after hearing.

This motion was filed and served 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 and grant the 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.

This motion is GRANTED. Movant shall be awarded fees of \$2,090.00.

# 8. $\frac{16-11129}{LKW-12}$ -B-13 IN RE: DAVID/LINDA MILAZZO

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR LEONARD K. WELSH, DEBTORS ATTORNEY(S)  $8-9-2018 \quad [194]$ 

LEONARD WELSH

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 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. Movant shall be awarded fees of \$2,090.00 and costs of \$44.88.

# 9. $\frac{18-12432}{MHM-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: SHANNON/TY WILLIAMS

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 8-1-2018 [19]

MICHAEL MEYER/MV RICHARD STURDEVANT RESPONSIVE PLEADING

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

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion was set for hearing on 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. The trustee's declaration states that the debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$3,100.00 and another payment in the same amount will be due on August 25, 2018. Doc. #21. Debtor filed a timely written opposition, stating that the debtor would be current on or before the hearing date. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. \$1307(c)(4), cause exists to dismiss this case. If debtor is current on or before the hearing date, then the trustee shall withdraw this motion. If debtor is not current, this motion is granted and no hearing is necessary.

#### 10. 18-11141-B-13 IN RE: ELENA HARPER

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION BY THE LAW OFFICE OF WAJDA LAW GROUP, APC FOR NICHOLAS M. WAJDA, DEBTORS ATTORNEY(S) 7-27-2018 [50]

NICHOLAS WAJDA

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

DISPOSITION: Denied without prejudice.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for failure to comply with the Local Rules of Practice ("LBR").

The notice did not contain the language required under LBR 9014-1(d)(3)(B)(iii). LBR 9014-1(d)(3)(B), which is about noticing requirements, requires movants to notify respondents that they can determine whether the matter has been resolved without oral argument or if the court has issued a tentative ruling by checking the Court's website at <a href="www.caeb.uscourts.gov">www.caeb.uscourts.gov</a> after 4:00 p.m. the day before the hearing.

# 11. $\frac{18-11141}{\text{WLG}-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: ELENA HARPER

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN 7-16-2018 [43]

ELENA HARPER/MV NICHOLAS WAJDA WITHDRAWN

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED: Movant withdrew the motion. Doc. #56.

# 12. $\frac{18-11649}{\text{MHM}-3}$ -B-13 IN RE: CHARLES/PRISCILLA HERNANDEZ

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TRUSTEE MICHAEL H. MEYER

8-20-2018 [60]

PATRICK KAVANAGH

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to October 4, 2018 at 9:00 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion will be set for a continued hearing on October 4, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. The court will issue an order. No appearance is necessary.

The trustee has filed a detailed objection to the debtors' fully noticed motion to confirm a chapter 13 plan. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or the trustee's opposition to confirmation is withdrawn, the debtors shall file and serve a written response not later than September 20, 2018. The response shall specifically address each issue raised in the opposition to confirmation, state whether the issue is disputed or undisputed, and include admissible evidence to support the debtors' position. If the debtors elect 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 September 27, 2018. If the debtors do not timely file a modified plan or a written response, the motion to confirm the plan will be denied on the grounds stated in the opposition without a further hearing.

# 13. $\frac{18-12358}{\text{MHM}-2}$ -B-13 IN RE: CHRISTIAN ORNELAS

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 7-20-2018 [42]

MICHAEL MEYER/MV NEIL SCHWARTZ DISMISSED 8/10/18

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED: An order dismissing the case has already been

entered. Doc. #62.

# 14. $\frac{17-12561}{PK-2}$ -B-13 IN RE: VICTOR/KARLA MOORE

MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN 8-2-2018 [52]

VICTOR MOORE/MV PATRICK KAVANAGH RESPONSIVE PLEADING

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to October 4, 2018 at 9:00 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion will be set for a continued hearing on October 4, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. The court will issue an order. No appearance is necessary.

The trustee has filed a detailed objection to the debtors' fully noticed motion to confirm a chapter 13 plan. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or the trustee's opposition to confirmation is withdrawn, the debtors shall file and serve a written response not later than September 20, 2018. The response shall specifically address each issue raised in the opposition to confirmation, state whether the issue is disputed or undisputed, and include admissible evidence to support the debtors' position. If the debtors elect 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 September 27, 2018. If the debtors do not timely file a modified plan or a written response, the motion to confirm the plan will be denied on the grounds stated in the opposition without a further hearing.

### 15. $\frac{18-12467}{MHM-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: ALLAN BABB

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 8-1-2018 [28]

MICHAEL MEYER/MV

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

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion was set for hearing on 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. The trustee's declaration states that the debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$200.00 and another payment in the same amount will have come due on August 25, 2018. Doc. #30. Debtor did not file or serve a written opposition. Therefore, pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) and #10.5.C. \$1307(c)(4), cause exists to dismiss this case.

### 16. $\frac{18-11570}{\text{MHM}-3}$ -B-13 IN RE: ETHAN APARICIO

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 7-24-2018 [36]

MICHAEL MEYER/MV LEONARD WELSH RESPONSIVE PLEADING

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

DISPOSITION: Denied as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion is DENIED AS MOOT.

This case has already been dismissed by court order dated August 23, 2018. Doc. #52, MHM-2. The order stayed the effectiveness of the dismissal until September 6, 2018. Therefore, this motion is DENIED AS MOOT.

# 17. $\frac{18-12179}{\text{MHM}-2}$ -B-13 IN RE: SAVINO VELASQUEZ AND DORA MEDRANO

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 7-23-2018 [20]

MICHAEL MEYER/MV WILLIAM OLCOTT RESPONSIVE PLEADING

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

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion was set for hearing on 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. The trustee's declaration states that the debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$1,915.00 and two more payments in the same amount would become due prior to the hearing date. Doc. #22. Debtor filed a timely written opposition, stating that the debtor inadvertently sent the first payment to the bankruptcy court and that they would be current on or before the hearing date. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(4), cause exists to dismiss this case. If debtor is current on or before the hearing date, then the trustee shall withdraw this motion. If debtor is not current, this motion is granted and no hearing is necessary.

### 18. $\frac{17-14681}{RSW-3}$ -B-13 IN RE: JOHN/OLIVIA JILES

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN 7-10-2018 [68]

JOHN JILES/MV ROBERT WILLIAMS DISMISSED 7/14/18

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED: An order dismissing the case has already been

entered. Doc. #79.

# 19. $\frac{18-10681}{WDO-2}$ -B-13 IN RE: RICHARD/MARIA LAUREYS

CONTINUED MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN 7-2-2018 [42]

RICHARD LAUREYS/MV WILLIAM OLCOTT RESPONSIVE PLEADING

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED: Movant withdrew the plan. Doc. #54.

### 20. <u>18-12381</u>-B-13 **IN RE: JERRY HILDRETH**

MHM-2

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 7-20-2018 [17]

MICHAEL MEYER/MV LUKAS JACKSON

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

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion was set for hearing on 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 <a href="Boone v. Burk">Boone v. Burk</a> (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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. The trustee's declaration states that the debtor has failed to provide necessary documents to the trustee's office. Doc. #19. Debtor did not file or serve a written opposition. Therefore, pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B)and 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1), cause exists to dismiss this case.

# 21. $\frac{18-12495}{AP-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: JOSIE JOHNSON

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.  $8-21-2018 \quad \mbox{\cite{beta}}$ 

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A./MV WENDY LOCKE/ATTY. FOR MV.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to November 8, 2018 at 9:00 a.m.

ORDER: No appearance is necessary. The court will issue the

order.

The trustee has not yet concluded the meeting of creditors and by prior order of the court, the trustee has another 7 days after completion of the creditors' meeting to file his objection to the plan. At the continued hearing, if the § 341 meeting has concluded, the court will call the matter and may set an evidentiary hearing or schedule further proceedings, if any are necessary.

#### 10:00 AM

# 1. $\frac{18-12001}{APN-1}$ -B-7 IN RE: DEBORAH BAGLEY

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY 8-3-2018 [17]

WELLS FARGO BANK N.A./MV ROBERT WILLIAMS AUSTIN NAGEL/ATTY. FOR MV.

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 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 abovementioned 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

The movant, Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., dba Wells Fargo Dealer Services, seeks relief from the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. §§ 362(d)(1) and (d)(2) with respect to a 2011 Hyundai Santa Fe.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) allows the court to grant relief from 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).

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) allow the court to grant relief from stay if the debtor does not have equity in the property and the property is not necessary to an effective reorganization.

After review of the included evidence, the court concludes that "cause" exists to lift the stay because there is no equity in the vehicle and debtor is delinquent in its monthly payments to movant.

The movant has produced evidence that the vehicle has a value of \$8,700.00 and debtor owes \$10,287.08 on the vehicle. Doc. #21. Debtor owes movant pre-petition amounts of \$769.45 and post-petition amounts of \$1,126.02.

Accordingly, the motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C.  $\S\S 362(d)(1)$  and (d)(2) to permit the movant to dispose of its collateral pursuant to applicable law and to use the proceeds from its disposition to satisfy its claim. No other relief is awarded.

Because the movant has not established that the value of its collateral exceeds the amount owed, the court awards no fees and costs in connection with the movant's secured claim as a result of the filing and prosecution of this motion. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be ordered waived due to the fact that the vehicle is depreciating in value.

<u>Unless the court expressly orders otherwise, the proposed order shall not include any other relief.</u> If the proposed order includes extraneous or procedurally incorrect relief that is only available in an adversary proceeding then the order will be rejected. See <u>In</u> re Van Ness, 399 B.R. 897 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009).

### 2. $\frac{18-10608}{LKW-1}$ -B-7 IN RE: BRADLEY/BETH RIGGEN

CONTINUED MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF DCR CREDIT RECOVERY, INC.  $3-27-2018 \quad [16]$ 

BRADLEY RIGGEN/MV LEONARD WELSH RESPONSIVE PLEADING

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to November 8, 2018 at 10:00 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

The parties have stipulated to continue the hearing to November 8, 2018 in order to settle this matter.

# 3. $\frac{18-12608}{VVF-1}$ -B-7 IN RE: CHRISTOPHER ZUECH

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY AND/OR MOTION FOR ADEQUATE PROTECTION  $8\!-\!8\!-\!2018$  [13]

HONDA LEASE TRUST/MV
R. BELL
VINCENT FROUNJIAN/ATTY. FOR MV.

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 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 abovementioned 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

The movant, Honda Lease Trust, seeks relief from the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. §§ 362(d)(1) and (d)(2) with respect to a 2016 Honda CRV.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) allows the court to grant relief from 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).

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) allow the court to grant relief from stay if the debtor does not have equity in the property and the property is not necessary to an effective reorganization.

After review of the included evidence, the court concludes that "cause" exists to lift the stay because there is no equity in the vehicle and debtor is delinquent in its monthly payments to movant. The movant has produced evidence that the vehicle has a value of \$19,520.00 and debtor owes \$21,476.74 on the vehicle. Doc. #15.

Debtor owes movant pre-petition amounts of \$350.18 and post-petition amounts of \$350.18.

Accordingly, the motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C.  $\S\S 362(d)(1)$  and (d)(2) to permit the movant to dispose of its collateral pursuant to applicable law and to use the proceeds from its disposition to satisfy its claim. No other relief is awarded.

Because the movant has not established that the value of its collateral exceeds the amount owed, the court awards no fees and costs in connection with the movant's secured claim as a result of the filing and prosecution of this motion. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be ordered waived due to the fact that the vehicle is depreciating in value and the debtor has possession of the vehicle.

<u>Unless the court expressly orders otherwise, the proposed order shall not include any other relief.</u> If the proposed order includes extraneous or procedurally incorrect relief that is only available in an adversary proceeding then the order will be rejected. See <u>In</u> re Van Ness, 399 B.R. 897 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009).

4.  $\frac{18-11322}{\text{JHW}-1}$ -B-7 IN RE: JEANNIE SAMUEL

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY 7-27-2018 [43]

AMERICREDIT FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC./MV ROBERT WILLIAMS JENNIFER WANG/ATTY. FOR MV.

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 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 abovementioned 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir.

1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

The movant, Americardit Financial Services, Inc. dba GM Financial, seeks relief from the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. §§ 362(d)(1) and (d)(2) with respect to a 2010 Toyota Rav4.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) allows the court to grant relief from 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).

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) allow the court to grant relief from stay if the debtor does not have equity in the property and the property is not necessary to an effective reorganization.

After review of the included evidence, the court concludes that "cause" exists to lift the stay because there is no equity in the vehicle and debtor is delinquent in its monthly payments to movant. The movant has produced evidence that the vehicle has a value of \$5,000.00 and debtor owes \$6,904.16 on the vehicle. Doc. #45. Debtor owes movant pre-petition amounts of \$980.64 and post-petition amounts of \$1,357.12.

Accordingly, the motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C.  $\S\S 362(d)(1)$  and (d)(2) to permit the movant to dispose of its collateral pursuant to applicable law and to use the proceeds from its disposition to satisfy its claim. No other relief is awarded.

Because the movant has not established that the value of its collateral exceeds the amount owed, the court awards no fees and costs in connection with the movant's secured claim as a result of the filing and prosecution of this motion. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be ordered waived due to the fact that the vehicle is depreciating in value.

<u>Unless the court expressly orders otherwise, the proposed order shall not include any other relief.</u> If the proposed order includes extraneous or procedurally incorrect relief that is only available in an adversary proceeding then the order will be rejected. See <u>In</u> re Van Ness, 399 B.R. 897 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009).

# 5. $\frac{18-11827}{NLG-2}$ -B-7 IN RE: JOSE/NANCY SANDOVAL

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY 7-11-2018 [25]

KERN SCHOOLS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION/MV
NEIL SCHWARTZ
NICHOLE GLOWIN/ATTY. FOR MV.

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

DISPOSITION: Granted in part as to the trustee's interest and

denied as moot in part as to the debtors' interest.

ORDER: The Moving Party shall submit a proposed order in

conformance with the ruling below.

This motion for relief from stay was fully noticed in compliance with the Local Rules of Practice and there was no opposition. The motion will be DENIED AS MOOT as to the debtors pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(C). The debtor's discharge was entered on August 29, 2018. Docket #34. The motion will be GRANTED IN PART for cause shown as to the chapter 7 trustee.

The movant, Kern Schools Federal Credit Union, seeks relief from the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. §§ 362(d)(1) and (d)(2) with respect to a piece of real property commonly known as 1513 Garfield Avenue in Bakersfield, CA 93304.

The automatic stay is terminated as it applies to the movant's right to enforce its remedies against the subject property under applicable nonbankruptcy law. The proposed order shall specifically describe the property or action to which the order relates. The order shall provide the motion is DENIED AS MOOT as to the debtors.

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be ordered waived due to the fact that debtor is delinquent in its obligation to movant.

Unless the court expressly orders otherwise, the proposed order shall not include any other relief. If the proposed order includes extraneous or procedurally incorrect relief that is only available in an adversary proceeding then the order will be rejected. See <u>In</u> re Van Ness, 399 B.R. 897 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009).

### 6. $\frac{18-12727}{\text{JHW}-1}$ -B-7 IN RE: ALBINO GONZALEZ

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY 7-31-2018 [11]

SANTANDER CONSUMER USA INC./MV NEIL SCHWARTZ JENNIFER WANG/ATTY. FOR MV.

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 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 abovementioned 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

The movant, Santander Consumer USA Inc., seeks relief from the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. §§ 362(d)(1) and (d)(2) with respect to a 2016 Buick Verano.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) allows the court to grant relief from 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).

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) allow the court to grant relief from stay if the debtor does not have equity in the property and the property is not necessary to an effective reorganization.

After review of the included evidence, the court concludes that "cause" exists to lift the stay because there is no equity in the vehicle, debtor is delinquent in its monthly payments to movant, and debtor intends to surrender the vehicle. The movant has produced evidence that the vehicle has a value of \$14,100.00 and debtor owes \$23,721.53 on the vehicle. Doc. #13. Debtor owes movant pre-petition amounts of \$1,841.00.

Accordingly, the motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C.  $\S 362(d)(1)$  and (d)(2) to permit the movant to dispose of its collateral pursuant to applicable law and to use the proceeds from its disposition to satisfy its claim. No other relief is awarded.

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be ordered waived due to the fact that the vehicle is depreciating in value.

<u>Unless the court expressly orders otherwise, the proposed order shall not include any other relief.</u> If the proposed order includes extraneous or procedurally incorrect relief that is only available in an adversary proceeding then the order will be rejected. See <u>In</u> re Van Ness, 399 B.R. 897 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009).

# 7. $\frac{18-12362}{APN-1}$ -B-7 IN RE: FREDDY/ESTHER AMAYA

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY 7-17-2018 [13]

FORD MOTOR CREDIT COMPANY/MV T. BELDEN AUSTIN NAGEL/ATTY. FOR MV.

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 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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  $\underline{\text{Boone }v.\ \text{Burk}}$  (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the abovementioned 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

The movant, Ford Motor Credit Company, seeks relief from the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) with respect to a 2015 Ford F150.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) allows the court to grant relief from 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).

After review of the included evidence, the court concludes that "cause" exists to lift the stay because debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$5,462.73, the bulk of which was owed pre-petition. Two more payments will have come due prior to this hearing date.

The court also notes that the trustee filed a report of no distribution on August 10, 2018.

Accordingly, the motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to permit the movant to dispose of its collateral pursuant to applicable law and to use the proceeds from its disposition to satisfy its claim. No other relief is awarded.

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be ordered waived due to the fact that the vehicle is depreciating in value.

#### 8. 18-12689-B-7 **IN RE: MARTIN GIUNTOLI**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE - FAILURE TO PAY FEES 8-16-2018 [21]

PHILLIP GILLET \$31.00 FILING FEE PAID 8/16/18

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

DISPOSITION: The OSC will be vacated.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

The fee was paid on August 16, 2018 in its entirety.

# 9. $\frac{18-12092}{LKW-1}$ -B-7 IN RE: SATINDERPAL SINGH

MOTION TO COMPEL ABANDONMENT 7-24-2018 [11]

SATINDERPAL SINGH/MV LEONARD WELSH RESPONSIVE PLEADING

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 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

11 U.S.C. § 554(b) provides that "on request of a party in interest and after notice and a hearing, the court may order the trustee to abandon any property of the estate that is burdensome to the estate or that is of inconsequential value and benefit to the estate." In order to grant a motion to abandon property, the bankruptcy court must find either that: (1) the property is burdensome to the estate or (2) of inconsequential value and inconsequential benefit to the estate. <u>In re Vu</u>, 245 B.R. 644, 647 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 2000). As one court noted, "an order compelling abandonment is the exception, not the rule. Abandonment should only be compelled in order to help the creditors by assuring some benefit in the administration of each asset... Absent an attempt by the trustee to churn property worthless to the estate just to increase fees, abandonment should rarely be ordered." In re K.C. Mach. & Tool Co., 816 F.2d 238, 246 (6th Cir. 1987). And in evaluating a proposal to abandon property, it is the interests of the estate and the creditors that have primary consideration, not the interests of the debtor. In re Johnson, 49 F.3d 538, 541 (9th Cir. 1995) (noting that the debtor is not mentioned in § 554). In re Galloway, No. AZ-13-1085-PaKiTa, 2014 Bankr. LEXIS 3626, at 16-17 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2014).

This motion is GRANTED. Based on the trustee's non-opposition and the evidence filed by debtor, the court finds that the estate's shares in SB Carrier, Inc. are of inconsequential value and shall be abandoned.

10.  $\frac{18-12092}{LKW-2}$ -B-7 IN RE: SATINDERPAL SINGH

MOTION TO COMPEL ABANDONMENT 7-24-2018 [17]

SATINDERPAL SINGH/MV LEONARD WELSH

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 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

11 U.S.C. § 554(b) provides that "on request of a party in interest and after notice and a hearing, the court may order the trustee to abandon any property of the estate that is burdensome to the estate or that is of inconsequential value and benefit to the estate." In order to grant a motion to abandon property, the bankruptcy court must find either that: (1) the property is burdensome to the estate or (2) of inconsequential value and inconsequential benefit to the estate. In re Vu, 245 B.R. 644, 647 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 2000). As one court noted, "an order compelling abandonment is the exception, not the rule. Abandonment should only be compelled in order to help the creditors by assuring some benefit in the administration of each asset... Absent an attempt by the trustee to churn property worthless to the estate just to increase fees, abandonment should rarely be ordered." In re K.C. Mach. & Tool Co., 816 F.2d 238, 246 (6th Cir. 1987). And in evaluating a proposal to abandon property, it is the

interests of the estate and the creditors that have primary consideration, not the interests of the debtor. <u>In re Johnson</u>, 49 F.3d 538, 541 (9th Cir. 1995) (noting that the debtor is not mentioned in § 554). <u>In re Galloway</u>, No. AZ-13-1085-PaKiTa, 2014 Bankr. LEXIS 3626, at 16-17 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2014).

This motion is GRANTED. The truck has a value of \$30,000.00 and is encumbered by a purchase-money security interest securing payment of \$31,370.88. The secured creditor has not yet filed any motion for relief from stay and liquidation of this asset will not yield any distribution to unsecured creditors. Based on the evidence filed by debtor, the court finds that the 2015 Cascadia Freightliner truck is of inconsequential value and shall be abandoned.

11.  $\frac{18-13347}{SL-1}$ -B-7 IN RE: ROGELIO/PATRICIA NUNEZ

MOTION TO COMPEL ABANDONMENT

NO RULING.

#### 10:30 AM

1.  $\frac{16-10643}{LKW-18}$ -B-12 IN RE: MARK FORREST

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR LEONARD K. WELSH, DEBTORS ATTORNEY(S)  $8-9-2018 \quad [250]$ 

LEONARD WELSH

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 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the 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 Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. Movant is awarded fees of \$6,965.00 and costs of \$34.40.

# 2. $\frac{17-11591}{LKW-17}$ -B-11 IN RE: 5 C HOLDINGS, INC.

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR CBIZ MHM, LLC, ACCOUNTANT(S)  $7-25-2018 \quad [432]$ 

CBIZ MHM, LLC/MV LEONARD WELSH

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

DISPOSITION: Denied without prejudice.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for failure to comply with the Local Rules of Practice ("LBR").

On motions filed on at least 28 days' notice, LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) requires the movant to notify the respondent or respondents that any opposition to motions filed on at least 28 days' notice must be in writing and must be filed with the court at least fourteen (14) days preceding the date or continued date of the hearing.

This motion was filed and served on July 25, 2018 and set for hearing on September 6, 2018. Doc. #433, 438. September 6, 2018 is more than 28 days after July 25, 2018, and therefore this hearing was set on 28 days' notice under LBR 9014-1(f)(1). The notice stated that "[n]o party in interest is required to file written opposition" and "[o]pposition, if any . . . may be presented at the hearing." Doc. #433. That is incorrect. Because the hearing was set on 28 days' notice, the notice should have stated that written opposition was required. Because this motion was filed, served, and noticed on 28 days' notice, the language of LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) needed to have been included in the notice.

#### 11:00 AM

1.  $\frac{17-10245}{17-1016}$  -B-13 IN RE: MICHAEL/CAROL LUSK

MOTION TO TAX COSTS AFTER TRIAL, AND/OR MOTION TO TAX ATTORNEY FEES AND EXPENSES  $8\!-\!1\!-\!2018$  [64]

PETERSON V. LUSK LISA HOLDER/ATTY. FOR MV. RESPONSIVE PLEADING

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

ORDER: Resolved by stipulation of the parties.

The parties have stipulated to allow fees and costs requested by Plaintiff Susan Peterson of \$54,802.29 less the costs to which Defendant Michael Lusk objected to (\$11,139.57). The total of \$43,662.72 will be taxed against Defendant.

2.  $\frac{17-11028}{18-1006}$  -B-11 IN RE: PACE DIVERSIFIED CORPORATION

AMENDED MOTION TO COMPEL ., AMENDED MOTION FOR AN IN-CAMERA REVIEW .

8-30-2018 [28]

PACE DIVERSIFIED CORPORATION ET AL V. MACPHERSON OIL T. BELDEN/ATTY. FOR MV.

NO RULING.