



**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California
Honorable René Lastreto II
Department B - Courtroom #13
Fresno, California**

Hearing Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2025

Unless otherwise ordered, all matters before the Honorable René Lastreto II, shall be simultaneously: (1) **In Person** at, Courtroom #13 (Fresno hearings only), (2) via **ZoomGov Video**, (3) via **ZoomGov Telephone**, and (4) via **CourtCall**. You may choose any of these options unless otherwise ordered or stated below.

All parties or their attorneys who wish to appear at a hearing remotely must sign up by **4:00 p.m. one business day** prior to the hearing. Information regarding how to sign up can be found on the **Remote Appearances** page of our website at <https://www.caeb.uscourts.gov/Calendar/CourtAppearances>. Each party/attorney 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 and their attorneys who wish to appear remotely must contact the Courtroom Deputy for the Department holding the hearing.

Please also note the following:

- Parties in interest and/or their attorneys 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 who wish to attend by ZoomGov may only listen in to the hearing using the Zoom telephone number. Video participation or observing are not permitted.
- Members of the public and the press may not listen in to trials or evidentiary hearings, though they may attend in person unless otherwise ordered.

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

1. Review the [Pre-Hearing Dispositions](#) prior to appearing at the hearing.
2. Parties appearing via CourtCall are encouraged to review the [CourtCall Appearance Information](#). If you are appearing by ZoomGov phone or video, please join at least 10 minutes prior to the start of the calendar and wait with your microphone muted until the matter is called.

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

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS

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

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

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

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

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

Post-Publication Changes: 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 any possible updates.

9:30 AM

1. [25-11500](#)-B-13 **IN RE: STEPHEN/ELIZABETH RAYBURN**
[WJH-1](#)

CONTINUED AMENDED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY
FRESNO OXYGEN AND WELDING SUPPLIERS, INC.
6-20-2025 [[21](#)]

FRESNO OXYGEN AND WELDING SUPPLIERS, INC./MV
GABRIEL WADDELL/ATTY. FOR DBT.
IAN QUINN/ATTY. FOR MV.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Overruled.

ORDER: Prevailing party to prepare order.

Creditor Fresno Oxygen and Welding Suppliers, Inc. dba Barnes Welding Supply ("Barnes") objects to confirmation of the debtors' chapter 13 plan. Doc. #21. Debtors Stephen Todd Rayburn and Elizabeth Maria Rayburn ("Debtors" or "Rayburn") opposed the objection. Doc. #31. Barnes filed a reply. Doc. #33.

The basis of the objection rests in two elements of the confirmation analysis. Under § 1325(a)(3) a debtor must establish that the plan has been proposed in good faith and not by any means forbidden by law. Subdivision (a)(7) also requires the debtor to establish that the action of the debtor in filing the petition was in good faith. Both of these issues are exhaustively analyzed in the court's tentative ruling on Barnes' motion to dismiss. *See Item #2, below.* The court will not repeat the analysis here. The court has tentatively ruled that the motion to dismiss is denied. As set forth in the tentative ruling, the court is convinced at this moment that both the filing of the petition by Rayburn and the proposal of the plan were in good faith. It should be noted that in the reply, Barnes essentially collapsed both the motion to dismiss and the objection. The court will do the same here.

This objection also raised Barnes' argument that under the plan, the debtors propose to pay for "luxury" items. Specifically, Barnes isolates a Range Rover vehicle, a recreation vehicle, and a classic Camaro as being paid directly by the Debtors.

Rayburn has explained the need for the Range Rover, and that the recreational vehicle is actually a source of income. Rayburn is ambivalent about the Camaro; however, it is subject to a lien which makes it difficult to surrender at this juncture. For purposes of plan confirmation, the court is convinced that the Debtors have met the elements.

Other than reserving the various positions in the objection, Barnes finally urges that it asserts a constructive trust against most of the assets of the bankruptcy estate. A constructive trust is a remedy which arises upon proof of inequitable conduct. Barnes argues that the inequitable conduct was Stephen Todd Rayburn's alleged embezzlement. That may be proven and one of the remedies for that may be a constructive trust under certain circumstances. But it has not been proven yet and is not an impediment to confirmation of the plan. An appropriate Adversary Proceeding testing the extent of the estate's ownership of assets will be necessary.

For the reasons indicated in its ruling on the Motion to Dismiss and as set forth here, the objection will be OVERRULED.

RULINGS ON BARNES' EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS

Any objection that is overruled is overruled on all grounds asserted.

Evidentiary Objection	<u>Ruling</u>
1.	Overruled
2.	Sustained
3.	Overruled
4.	Overruled
5.	Overruled
6.	Sustained
7.	Overruled
8.	Overruled
9.	Sustained
10.	Overruled
11.	Overruled on both grounds
12.	Sustained
13.	Overruled

2. [25-11500](#)-B-13 **IN RE: STEPHEN/ELIZABETH RAYBURN**
[WJH-3](#)

CONTINUED MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
7-10-2025 [\[36\]](#)

FRESNO OXYGEN AND WELDING SUPPLIERS, INC./MV
GABRIEL WADDELL/ATTY. FOR DBT.
IAN QUINN/ATTY. FOR MV.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Denied.

ORDER: The court will issue the order.

Fresno Oxygen and Welding Suppliers, Inc. dba Barnes Welding Supply ("Barnes") asks the court to dismiss this pending chapter 13 case with prejudice under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c) and § 349(a). Debtor Stephen Rayburn and Elizabeth Maria Rayburn ("Debtors" or "Rayburn") oppose the motion.

Though presented with a great deal of evidence by Barnes, the court is unpersuaded that the "totality of the circumstances" support dismissal of this bankruptcy case at this time let alone dismissal with prejudice. Accordingly, the motion will be DENIED.

I.

Co-debtor Todd Rayburn was employed by Barnes for approximately 22 years. He served as controller and chief financial officer.

In April 2024, Rayburn was terminated by Barnes when Rayburn allegedly embezzled \$3.2 million from Barnes. Rayburn strongly disputes the allegations.

In late 2024, Barnes sued Rayburn in Fresno County Superior Court (Action #24-CECG-02617) ("civil action"). Barnes asserts numerous claims including fraudulent conversion, conversion, promissory fraud, negligence, and breach of fiduciary duty. The civil action was in the early discovery phase when this bankruptcy case was filed May 7, 2025.

Apparently, the bankruptcy case was filed shortly after Barnes had noticed Elizabeth Rayburn's deposition.

Barnes has filed this motion to dismiss and has also objected to confirmation of Rayburn's proposed chapter 13 plan. Barnes filed a proof of claim in this case asserting that the estate owes Barnes over \$3.2 million. Attached to the proof of claim is a copy of the second amended complaint in the civil action.

At the end of July 2025, Barnes filed a complaint contesting the discharge of its claim. The parties have stipulated that Rayburn's time to file a response to the complaint has been extended to near the end of September 2025.

Rayburn promptly filed a chapter 13 plan providing for monthly payments in excess of \$5,000.00 for 60 months. Under the plan, Rayburn will pay monthly payments on a 2023 Land Rover and will make direct payments on two mortgages as well as payments for a recreational vehicle and a vintage Chevrolet Camaro. Unsecured creditors will receive 22% on estimated claims of over \$500,000. The claim estimate does not include the \$3.2 million claim asserted by Barnes.

II.

Under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c) a court may dismiss a case under chapter 13 "for cause." Bad faith is not among the eleven enumerated reasons for dismissal or conversion under § 1307(c). However, bad faith is a basis for dismissal. *Eisen v. Curry (In re Eisen)*, 14 F.3d 469(9th Cir. 1994).

Ordinarily, dismissal of a bankruptcy case does not bar the discharge in a later case for dischargeable debts in the case dismissed. However, a bankruptcy court may order otherwise "for cause." 11 U.S.C. § 349(a). Cause for dismissal of a case under § 1307 is not as rigorous as "cause" required for dismissal of the case with prejudice. The latter requires egregious behavior. *In re Duran*, 636 B.R. 797, 810 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2021).

In *Leavitt v. Soto (In re Leavitt)*, 171 F.3d 1219 (1999), the Ninth Circuit reiterated that in order to dismiss a chapter 13 case with prejudice, a bankruptcy court must look at the "totality of circumstances." *Id.* at 1224. The examination of the circumstances is informed by four inquiries:

1. Whether the debtor misrepresented facts in his petition or plan, unfairly manipulated the Bankruptcy Code or otherwise filed chapter 13 in an inequitable manner.
2. The debtor's history of filings and dismissals.
3. Whether the debtor only intended to defeat state court litigation.
4. Whether egregious behavior is present.

The court will examine these issues in turn.

III.

1. Misrepresentation, Unfair Manipulation or Filed Chapter 13 in an Inequitable Manner.

Barnes argues that the Debtors failed to disclose the source of the funds used to purchase most if not all the assets listed in the

petition. Barnes contends those funds were obtained by Todd Rayburn's embezzlement. Barnes also argues that facts were misrepresented because the Debtors listed Barnes claim as unknown even though the complaint states the claim is \$3.2 million.

Barnes also contends that the Debtors undervalued their interests in luxury items including vehicles, furnishings and jewelry. Then Barnes questions the Debtors qualifications to be a franchisee in a new business which had capital requirements that the Debtors do not seem able to achieve.

The Debtors respond by noting that the bankruptcy schedules do not require that the source of funds for the acquisition of assets be stated. Further, the Debtors claim that all assets have been listed in the schedules. As to the franchise capital requirements raised by Barnes, the Debtors contend that they revealed all the assets that were sold by Rayburn so he could build the new business.

As to the listing of Barnes claim, it is listed as disputed, contingent and unliquidated, which is consistent with being fully candid in Schedule disclosures.

Based on the evidence presently before the court, it does not appear that the Debtors misrepresented facts in its petition or plan. Barnes' claim that assets were undervalued or omitted is unsupported and, at this moment, is conjecture. There is nothing inequitable or manipulative in filing a bankruptcy case to reorganize debts and attempt to repay creditors to the best of the debtors' abilities even with impending litigation.

That said, the court is mindful that there is significant evidence that many transactions brought to the court's attention involving Todd Rayburn are questionable. However, that has not be conclusively determined by any court. A motion to dismiss is not the forum to fully vent dischargeability issues.

Accordingly, the court finds that at this time the Debtors have not misrepresented facts in their petition or plan, unfairly manipulated the Bankruptcy Code or otherwise filed chapter 13 in an inequitable manner.

2. Debtors History of Filings and Dismissals.

It is undisputed that this is codebtor Elizabeth Rayburn's first bankruptcy filing. Codebtor Todd Rayburn did file a chapter 7 case 15 years earlier which resulted in a discharge.

Accordingly, the court finds that the Debtors' history of filings and dismissals in this case does not support dismissal with prejudice.

3. Debtors Intended to Defeat State Court Litigation.

Barnes argues that this chapter 13 was filed shortly after Barnes noticed the deposition of codebtor Elizabeth Rayburn. Accordingly,

Barnes contends that the filing was intended to defeat its ongoing discovery efforts in the civil action.

The Debtors counter by acknowledging that mounting litigation costs were a motivating factor. However, the pending litigation was not the *only* factor. The Debtors owed two mortgages, multiple car loans and over \$500,000.00 in unsecured debt. There are therefore other motivations besides the litigation.

The court finds that the pending litigation was a significant factor in the Debtors filing of this bankruptcy case. However, it was not the *only* factor. Other creditors besides Barnes need to be addressed by the Debtors. Further, filing of a bankruptcy case while litigation is pending alone has rarely been found to be sufficient to dismiss a case for bad faith absent other circumstances. One need only look at the numerous filings by various arch-dioceses throughout the United States motivated by numerous claims of abuse. This factor therefore militates against dismissal.

4. Whether Egregious Behavior is Present.

Barnes contends that the court should have reason to believe that the Debtors did not schedule all of their assets. They further argue that the Debtors were able to qualify as franchisees for their new business. To do so, the Debtors had to have a net worth exceeding what the bankruptcy schedules reveal. Barnes also argues that it asserts a constructive trust on all assets in the schedules. Finally, Barnes contends that based on the Debtors' intentions in paying for luxury items outside of the plan, suggest that the Debtors merely want to preserve a lavish lifestyle.

Debtors counter that there is no egregious behavior alleged or asserted that was committed by the Debtors in the bankruptcy case which is the relevant inquiry. The Debtors, of course, deny any wrongdoing in connection with the embezzlement claims.

True enough, a debtor's prebankruptcy past is not immune from inclusion in the totality of circumstances examination attendant to a good faith standard. *Fidelity and Casualty Corp. of New York v. Warren (In re Warren)*, 89 B.R. 87, 94 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1988). Indeed, further inquiries are warranted into good faith when a nominal repayment plan is attended by a nondischargeable debt. *Id.*

The problem for Barnes here is there has been no adjudication of the existence of a nondischargeable debt. There are evidence-based allegations that suggest Barnes' claim may at least in part be nondischargeable, but the Debtors dispute those, and the claims have not been adjudicated.

Further, an effort by the debtor to discharge a nondischargeable debt is not per se bad faith. See *Street v. Lawson (In re Street)*, 55 B.R. 763, 765 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). Barnes has a forum in the bankruptcy

case to contest whether its claim is dischargeable. It has started that process by filing a pending adversary proceeding. It was during the early discovery phase of the civil action when this case was filed.

Barnes has not pointed to any egregious behavior of either Debtor in this bankruptcy case which is a relevant inquiry.

Also, Barnes does not directly implicate codebtor Elizabeth Rayburn in any of the allegations supporting this motion.

This court therefore finds that there is an absence of proof of egregious behavior in the bankruptcy case. Thus, this factor does not support dismissal.

IV.

For the foregoing reasons, Barnes' Motion to Dismiss this bankruptcy case with prejudice will be DENIED.

The court notes that Todd Rayburn's declaration contains allegations that the "corporate culture" at Barnes allowed principals to allegedly misuse corporate funds. To the extent such a contention is pursued, the court cautions the Debtors to tread lightly because the "everybody else did it" defense does not hold sway.

RULINGS ON DEBTORS' EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS

Any objection that is overruled is overruled on all grounds asserted.

<u>Evidentiary Objection</u>	<u>Ruling</u>
1.	Overruled
2.	Overruled
3.	Overruled
4.	Sustained, lacks foundation
5.	Overruled
6.	Sustained, lacks foundation
7.	Overruled
8.	Sustained, lacks foundation
9.	Sustained, lacks foundation
10.	Sustained, hearsay
11.	Sustained, hearsay
12.	Sustained, hearsay
13.	Sustained, hearsay
14.	Sustained, hearsay

15.	Overruled
16.	Overruled
17.	Overruled
18.	Sustained, lacks foundation
19.	Sustained, lacks foundation
20.	Sustained, lacks foundation
21.	Sustained, lacks foundation
22.	Sustained, hearsay
23.	Sustained, hearsay
24.	Sustained, hearsay
25.	Sustained, hearsay
26.	Sustained, hearsay
27.	Sustained, hearsay
28.	Overruled
29.	Sustained, hearsay
30.	Sustained, hearsay
31.	Sustained, lacks foundation
32.	Sustained, hearsay
33.	Sustained, hearsay
34.	Sustained, hearsay
35.	Overruled
36.	Sustained, lacks foundation
37.	Sustained, lacks foundation
38.	Sustained, lacks foundation
39.	Sustained, lacks foundation
40.	Sustained, lacks foundation
41.	Sustained, lacks foundation
42.	Overruled
43.	Sustained, lacks foundation
44.	Overruled
45.	Overruled
46.	Sustained, lacks foundation
47.	Overruled
48.	Sustained, irrelevant
49.	Sustained, irrelevant
50.	Sustained, Irrelevant
51.	Sustained, irrelevant

3. [25-12630](#)-B-13 **IN RE: JOHNNY THOMAS**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR FAILURE TO UPDATE CONTACT
INFORMATION IN PACER
8-20-2025 [[14](#)]

CANDACE ARROYO/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: The OSC will be vacated.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

The record shows that the matter has been corrected by counsel. Accordingly, this order to show cause will be VACATED. No appearance is necessary.

4. [24-11938](#)-B-13 **IN RE: MICHAEL GARDNER**
[SKI-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
8-5-2025 [[42](#)]

HYUNDAI CAPITAL AMERICA/MV
GABRIEL WADDELL/ATTY. FOR DBT.
SHERYL ITH/ATTY. FOR MV.

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

DISPOSITION: Denied as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue the order.

Hyundai Capital America ("Movant") brings this *Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay* against Michael Ray Gardner ("Debtor") as to a 2024 Hyundai Sonata Hybrid ("Vehicle"). Doc. #42. The confirmed plan reflects that Movant is listed as a Class 4 creditor and the Vehicle is to be surrendered to Movant. Docs. #3, #20. Accordingly, the automatic stay is not in effect as to the Vehicle, and Movant is already free "to exercise its rights against its collateral and any non-debtor in the event of a default under applicable law or contract." Doc. #3 at 3.11

Movant is free to exercise its rights in the collateral. The declaration of Ms. Benoit filed in support of this motion notes lack of payment and lack of insurance as the primary bases for "cause" for stay relief. Since the confirmed Plan surrenders the collateral, the Vehicle is not necessary to a reorganization either.

Since Movant already can exercise its rights, stay relief is now moot.
The motion is DENIED.

5. [25-11540](#)-B-13 **IN RE: MARGARET GRAVELLE**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE - FAILURE TO PAY FEES
8-12-2025 [[36](#)]

DISMISSED 8/14/25

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped and taken off calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

An order dismissing the case was entered on August 14, 2025. Doc. #41.
Accordingly, this Order to Show Cause will be taken off calendar as
moot. No appearance is necessary.

6. [25-12640](#)-B-13 **IN RE: ROBERT GUYNN**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE - FAILURE TO PAY FEES
8-18-2025 [[11](#)]

DISMISSED 8/22/25

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped and taken off calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

An order dismissing the case was entered on August 22, 2025. Doc. #13.
Accordingly, this Order to Show Cause will be taken off calendar as
moot. No appearance is necessary.

7. [23-10646](#)-B-13 **IN RE: DANNY/ROSEMARY MEDEIROS**

[JDR-3](#)

MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
7-29-2025 [[67](#)]

ROSEMARY MEDEIROS/MV
JEFFREY ROWE/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Granted.

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

Danny and Rosemary Medeiros ("Debtors") move for an order confirming the *Third Modified Chapter 13 Plan* dated July 29, 2025. Docs. #67, #69. Debtor's current plan was confirmed on January 9, 2025. Doc. #63

No party has timely objected.

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 any party in interest, including but not limited to creditors, the U.S. Trustee, and the case Trustee, 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). Therefore, the defaults of the above-mentioned parties in interest are entered. Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amounts of damages). *Televideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987).

The motion requests that the confirmed plan be modified as follows:

1. Debtors have paid an aggregate of \$44,498.10 through month 28.
2. For months 29-60, the plan payment will be reduced from \$2,060.60 to \$1,977.85.

Doc. #69.

Debtors declare that this modification is necessary to cure a deficiency that arose because of unexpected medical bills. Doc. #71. It is not immediately clear to the court how Debtors can cure a deficiency in plan payments through a modified plan that *reduces* the monthly plan payments by \$83.75 per month going forward, but the Trustee has not objected to confirmation, so the court presumes that the Trustee considers this plan feasible.

On July 29, 2025, Debtors filed their *Amended Schedule I & J*, which reflects a monthly net income of \$4,232, an amount sufficient to make the proposed plan payments. Doc. #72.

No party in interest has objected, and the defaults of all non-responding parties in interest are entered. This motion is GRANTED. The order shall include the docket control number of the motion, shall reference the plan by the date it was filed, and shall be approved as to form by Trustee.

8. [25-11855](#)-B-13 **IN RE: ONASIS JIMENEZ**
[LGT-1](#)

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
8-1-2025 [[29](#)]

LILIAN TSANG/MV
ERIC ESCAMILLA/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to October 8, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will prepare the order.

Chapter 13 Trustee Lilian G. Tsang ("Trustee") moves to dismiss this Chapter 13 case on the grounds of unreasonable delay by the debtor that is prejudicial to creditors and failure to set a modified plan for hearing with notice to creditors. Doc. #29. On August 26, 2025, Onasis Alberto Jimenez ("Debtor") filed a response stating that Debtor had filed a motion for authorization to refinance his home and for court approval of a loan modification agreement. Doc. #42. The response averred that, should the loan modification be approved by the court, Debtor would file a Second Amended Plan which would resolve Debtor's proposed grounds for dismissal. *Id.* Debtor requested a continuance of this matter to October 8, 2025, to give him to time to file said Second Amended Plan after approval of the modification. *Id.*

On September 3, 2025, the court entered a Prehearing Disposition whereby the court indicated that the court would grant the Debtor's Motion for approval of the loan modification, although no order has been prepared and submitted by Debtor as of this date. Doc. #45. In light of the foregoing, this matter will be CONTINUED to October 8, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

9. [25-11162](#)-B-13 **IN RE: GANDALF/LISA COIGNY**
[PBB-1](#)

MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
7-28-2025 [\[19\]](#)

LISA COIGNY/MV
PETER BUNTING/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Granted.

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

Gandalf and Lisa Coigny ("Debtors") move for an order confirming the *First Modified Chapter 13 Plan* dated July 28, 2025. Docs. #19, #21. Debtor's current plan was confirmed on June 2, 2025. Doc. #13.

No party has timely objected.

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 any party in interest, including but not limited to creditors, the U.S. Trustee, and the case Trustee, 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). Therefore, the defaults of the above-mentioned parties in interest are entered. Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amounts of damages). *Televideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987).

The motion requests that the confirmed plan be modified as follows:

1. Plan payments will be \$1,501.00 per month for months 1-3, followed by \$700.00 per month for months 4-60.
2. The plan's duration will increase from 44 months to 60 months.
3. Pursuant to section 2.02, Debtors will make a one-time lump sum payment into the plan in the amount of \$21,194.17 in month 4 of the plan. These funds will be paid from a post-petition life insurance inheritance.
4. Attorneys' fees will be paid as follows: aggregate amount of \$579.54 in the first 3 months, followed by \$138.96 per month thereafter and for the life of the plan.
5. The plan is otherwise unmodified.

Doc. #21.

Debtors aver that this modification is necessary because they could not afford their original plan payment but will be able to afford the

reduced monthly payment. Doc. #22. This is confirmed by Debtors' Amended Schedule I & J dated July 31, 2025, which reflects a monthly net income of \$885.50, which is adequate to meet the proposed plan payment. Doc. #27.

No party in interest has objected, and the defaults of all non-responding parties in interest are entered. This motion is GRANTED. The order shall include the docket control number of the motion, shall reference the plan by the date it was filed, and shall be approved as to form by Trustee.

10. [24-13064](#)-B-13 **IN RE: CAM CASTRO**
[PBB-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF CAVALRY SPV I, LLC, CLAIM NUMBER 1
7-17-2025 [\[23\]](#)

CAM CASTRO/MV
PETER BUNTING/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Sustained.

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

Cam Castro ("Debtor") objects to Proof of Claim #1 ("POC #1") filed by Cavalry SPV I, LLC ("Claimant") in the sum of \$9,637.55 and seeks that it be disallowed in its entirety. Doc. #23.

This objection was set for hearing on 44 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 3007-1(b)(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 sustaining of the objection. *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 amounts of damages). *Televideo Sys., 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.

Claimant was properly served on July 17, 2025, by first-class mail to the address designated on Claimant's proof of claim for receiving

notices and to Claimant's registered agent in accordance with Rule. 3007(a)(2)(A). Doc. #27.

11 U.S.C. § 502(a) states that a claim or interest, evidenced by a proof filed under section 501, is deemed allowed, unless a party in interest objects.

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) states that a proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with these rules shall constitute *prima facie* evidence of the validity and amount of the claim. If a party objects to a proof of claim, the burden of proof is on the objecting party. *Lundell v. Anchor Constr. Specialists, Inc.*, 223 F.3d 1035, 1039 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2000).

Here, the movant has established that the statute of limitations in California bars a creditor's action to recover on a contract, obligation, or liability founded on an oral contract after two years and one founded on a written instrument after four years. See California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 312, 337(1), and 339. A claim that is unenforceable under state law is also not allowed under 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1) once objected to. *In re GI Indust., Inc.*, 204 F.3d 1276, 1281 (9th Cir. 2000). Regardless of whether the contract was written or oral, the last transaction on the account according to the evidence was on March 21, 2019, which is well past the two and four year mark in the statutes of limitations.

Therefore, claim no. 1 filed by Cavalry SPV I, LLC is disallowed in its entirety.

11. [24-13064](#)-B-13 **IN RE: CAM CASTRO**
[PBB-2](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF LVNV FUNDING, LLC, CLAIM NUMBER 2
7-17-2025 [[28](#)]

CAM CASTRO/MV
PETER BUNTING/ATTY. FOR DBT.
WITHDRAWN

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

Movant withdrew the objection on July 28, 2025. Doc. #45.

12. [24-13064](#)-B-13 **IN RE: CAM CASTRO**
[PBB-3](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF LVNV FUNDING, LLC, CLAIM NUMBER 3
7-17-2025 [\[33\]](#)

CAM CASTRO/MV
PETER BUNTING/ATTY. FOR DBT.
WITHDRAWN

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

Movant withdrew the objection on July 28, 2025. Doc. #47.

13. [24-13064](#)-B-13 **IN RE: CAM CASTRO**
[PBB-4](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF AMERICAN EXPRESS NATIONAL BANK,
CLAIM NUMBER 6
7-18-2025 [\[38\]](#)

CAM CASTRO/MV
PETER BUNTING/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Sustained.

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

Cam Castro ("Debtor") objects to Proof of Claim #6-1 ("POC #6-1")
filed by American Express National Bank ("Claimant") in the sum of
\$1,588.85 and seeks that it be disallowed in its entirety. Doc. #38.

This objection was set for hearing on 44 days' notice as required by
Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 3007-1(b)(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 sustaining of the objection. *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 amounts of damages). *Televideo Sys., 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.

Claimant was properly served on July 18, 2025, by first-class mail to the address designated on Claimant's proof of claim for receiving notices in accordance with Rule. 3007(a)(2)(A). Doc. #27. Debtors complied with Rule 7004(h), which requires that, barring certain exceptions, service to insured depository institutions be made by certified mail and addressed to an officer.

11 U.S.C. § 502(a) states that a claim or interest, evidenced by a proof filed under section 501, is deemed allowed, unless a party in interest objects.

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) states that a proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with these rules shall constitute *prima facie* evidence of the validity and amount of the claim. If a party objects to a proof of claim, the burden of proof is on the objecting party. *Lundell v. Anchor Constr. Specialists, Inc.*, 223 F.3d 1035, 1039 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2000).

Here, the movant has established that the statute of limitations in California bars a creditor's action to recover on a contract, obligation, or liability founded on an oral contract after two years and one founded on a written instrument after four years. See California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 312, 337(1), and 339. A claim that is unenforceable under state law is also not allowed under 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1) once objected to. *In re GI Indust., Inc.*, 204 F.3d 1276, 1281 (9th Cir. 2000).

Regardless of whether the contract was written or oral, the last transaction on the account according to the evidence was in April 2019, and the account was charged off in November 2019, which is well past the two- and four-year marks in the statutes of limitations. See POC #6.

Therefore, claim no. 6-1 filed by American Express National Bank is disallowed in its entirety.

14. [25-11964](#)-B-13 **IN RE: ALIANNA YOUNG**
[PGM-1](#)

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR PETER G. MACALUSO,
DEBTORS ATTORNEY(S)
8-11-2025 [\[14\]](#)

PETER MACALUSO/ATTY. FOR DBT.
DISMISSED 06/30/2025;

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

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The movant will prepare the order in conformance with
 this opinion.

Peter G. Macaluso ("Applicant"), counsel for Alianna Young ("Debtor") in the above-captioned case, requests final compensation in the amount of \$3,000.00 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330 for the period from June 5, 2025, through June 26, 2025. Doc. #14 *et seq.* This is Applicant's first and final request for compensation. The amount sought represents 8.5 hours of work performed for Debtor both prior to and immediately after the filing of the petition, and Applicant seeks to be paid from the \$3,000.00 prepetition retainer paid by Debtor before the commencement of the case. *Id.*

The case was filed on June 12, 2025, and dismissed on June 30, 2025, for failure to timely file documents. Docs. #1, #9. The motion is accompanied by a Declaration from Applicant stating that he accepted the representation under the "no look" fee structure for \$10,000.00 in compensation, with \$3,000.00 paid as a retainer and the remaining \$7,000.00 to be paid through the plan. Doc. #16. Applicant declares that Debtor failed to meet with Applicant to sign documents not filed with the petition, including Schedules, the Chapter 13 plan, and the Rights and Responsibilities form, and the case was subsequently dismissed due to failure to timely file those documents. *Id.*

No party in interest timely filed written opposition. This motion will be GRANTED.

This motion was set for hearing on 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. ("Rule") 2002(a)(6). The failure of the creditors, the chapter 13 trustee, 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 amounts of damages). *Televideo Sys. 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.

Applicant's firm provided 8.5 billable hours at \$400.00 per hour, totaling \$3,400.00 in fees. Doc. #16. Applicant does not seek expense reimbursement. *Id.* Although the total fees incurred was \$3,400.00, Applicant does not seek compensation in excess of the \$3,000.00 retainer. *Id.*

11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1)(A) & (B) permits approval of "reasonable compensation for actual necessary services rendered by . . . [a] professional person" and "reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses." In determining the amount of reasonable compensation to be awarded to a professional person, the court shall consider the nature, extent, and value of such services, considering all relevant factors, including those enumerated in subsections (a)(3)(A) through (E). § 330(a)(3).

Applicant's services here included, without limitation: prepetition meeting with Debtor; review of prior filings by Debtor; preparation and filing of skeletal petition; notice of filing to Carmax; email correspondence with Debtor; draft of schedules for review by Debtor; communications with Debtor; and review of the proof of claim from the Department of Education. The court finds these services and expenses reasonable, actual, and necessary.

No party in interest timely filed written opposition. Accordingly, this motion will be GRANTED. Applicant shall be awarded \$3,000.00 in fees as reasonable compensation for services rendered and \$0.00 in reimbursement of actual, necessary expenses on a final basis under 11 U.S.C. § 330. Applicant is authorized to apply the \$3,000.00 retainer to this award services from June 5, 2025, through June 26, 2025.

15. [25-12367](#)-B-13 **IN RE: KATHERINE SCONIERS STANPHILL**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE - FAILURE TO PAY FEES
8-20-2025 [\[21\]](#)

DISMISSED 8/27/25

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped and taken off calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

An order dismissing the case was entered on August 27, 2025. Doc. #24. Accordingly, this Order to Show Cause will be taken off calendar as moot. No appearance is necessary.

16. [25-12176](#)-B-13 **IN RE: MELINDA EDWARDS**
[LGT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
8-13-2025 [\[12\]](#)

LILIAN TSANG/MV
SCOTT LYONS/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to October 8, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Chapter 13 trustee Lilian G. Tsang ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the *Chapter 13 Plan* filed by Melinda Edwards ("Debtor") on June 30, 2025, on the following basis:

1. Trustee requires additional documentation on a Schedule D debt owed to private lender, Jake Thornton, which is secured by an interest in Debtor's home.
2. The feasibility of Debtor's plan depends on a \$3,000.00 monthly contribution from Debtor's father for living expenses. Trustee requests verification from Debtor's father that he is willing, able, and committed to providing this contribution for the life of the plan.

Doc. #12.

This objection will be CONTINUED to October 8, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or the objection to confirmation is withdrawn, the Debtor shall file and serve a written response to the Objection not later than **14 days**

before the hearing. The response shall specifically address each issue raised in the objection to confirmation, state whether the issue is disputed or undisputed, and include admissible evidence to support the Debtors' position. Any reply shall be served no later than **7 days before the hearing.**

If the Debtor elects to withdraw the 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 **7 days before the hearing.** If the Debtor does not timely file a modified plan or a written response, this objection will be sustained on the grounds stated in the objection without further hearing.

17. [25-11296](#)-B-13 **IN RE: CHARRY SEE AND SOMCHITH XAIVONG**
[MAZ-1](#)

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
7-24-2025 [\[26\]](#)

SOMCHITH XAIVONG/MV
MARK ZIMMERMAN/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to October 8, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Charry See and Somchith Xaivong ("Debtors") move for an order confirming the *First Modified Chapter 13 Plan* dated July 24, 2025. Docs. #26, #28. No plan has been confirmed so far. Chapter 13 trustee Lilian G. Tsang ("Trustee") timely objected to confirmation of the plan for the following reason(s):

1. To meet the liquidation test, Trustee estimates that at least \$4,545.29 or 17.43% must be paid to unsecured creditors. The plan proposes to pay only \$2,772.92 to general unsecured claims presently totaling \$23,360.72.
2. The plan provides for ongoing mortgage claims in the amount of \$873.00 to Class 1 Creditor USDA Rural Housing, but according to the proof of claim, the ongoing payments are actually \$1,169.94.
3. The plan provides for an arrearage to USDA Rural Housing in the amount of \$29,700.70, but that creditor's proof of claim lists arrears in the amount of \$31,136.08. The proposed dividend must be increased from \$495.01 to \$518.93 to fund within 60 months.
4. The plan states that in months 1-2, Debtors have paid an aggregate of \$3,634.00 into the plan. Trustee asserts that they have only paid an aggregate of \$1,634.00 into the plan, resulting in a \$2,000.00 delinquency.

5. The plan payment must increase to \$2,093.45 per month to fund properly but based on the most recent Schedules I & J, Debtors cannot afford that payment.
6. The aggregate payment of \$3,634.00 for months 1 and 2, aside from being inaccurate, is insufficient to pay the monthly dividends required to be paid for months 1 and 2. To pay those dividends, the plan payments would need to be \$2,015.87 per month for months 1 and 2, for an aggregate of \$4,031.74.

Doc. #36. On September 8, 2025, the Debtors filed a *Response* to the Objection, but not all the grounds for objection raised by Trustee were addressed in the *Response*. Doc. #38.

This motion to confirm plan will be CONTINUED to October 8, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or all objections to confirmation are withdrawn, the Debtor shall file and serve a written response to the objections no later than fourteen (14) days before the continued hearing date. The response shall specifically address each issue raised in the objection(s) to confirmation, state whether each issue is disputed or undisputed, and include admissible evidence to support the Debtor's position. Any replies shall be filed and served no later than seven (7) days prior to the hearing date.

If the Debtor elects to withdraw the 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 seven (7) days before the continued hearing date. If the Debtor does not timely file a modified plan or a written response, the objection will be sustained on the grounds stated, and the motion will be denied without further hearing.

18. [25-12098](#)-B-13 **IN RE: ADAM BRYANT**
[LGT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
8-12-2025 [[13](#)]

LILIAN TSANG/MV
RABIN POURNAZARIAN/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to October 8, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Chapter 13 trustee Lilian G. Tsang ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the *Chapter 13 Plan* filed by Adam Bryant ("Debtor") on June 25, 2025, on the following basis:

1. The plan provides for Valley First Credit Union as a Class 2 claimant for secured debt in the amount of \$20,379.00 at 4.00% interest and a monthly dividend of \$375.30. The debt is secured by a 2014 Ford F250. However, Debtor has indicated that the vehicle was sold post-petition and the loan paid in full. This creditor should be removed from Class 2.

Doc. #13.

This objection will be CONTINUED to October 8, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or the objection to confirmation is withdrawn, the Debtor shall file and serve a written response to the Objection not later than **14 days before the hearing**. The response shall specifically address each issue raised in the objection to confirmation, state whether the issue is disputed or undisputed, and include admissible evidence to support the Debtors' position. Any reply shall be served no later than **7 days before the hearing**.

If the Debtor elects to withdraw the 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 **7 days before the hearing**. If the Debtor does not timely file a modified plan or a written response, this objection will be sustained on the grounds stated in the objection without further hearing.

19. [25-11268](#)-B-13 **IN RE: PETER/SANDRA ORLOFF**
[LGT-1](#)

CONTINUED MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
7-18-2025 [\[21\]](#)

LILIAN TSANG/MV
ROBERT WILLIAMS/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to November 5, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

ORDER: The court will prepare the order.

This *Motion to Dismiss* will be CONTINUED TO November 5, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. to be heard in conjunction with the Debtors' *Motion to Confirm First Modified Chapter 13 Plan* dated September 6, 2025. See Doc. #31 *et seq.*

11:00 AM

1. [24-11813](#)-B-7 **IN RE: MARIA MACHAIN AND MIGUEL NUNEZ HERNANDEZ**
[24-1034](#)

CONTINUED PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
9-18-2024 [[1](#)]

IBARRA V. MACHAIN ET AL
MARC VOISENAT/ATTY. FOR PL.

NO RULING.

2. [23-12426](#)-B-7 **IN RE: RAUL FERNANDEZ-MARTINEZ**
[25-1021](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
5-21-2025 [[1](#)]

FEAR V. PAPE TRUCK LEASING, INC.
GABRIEL WADDELL/ATTY. FOR PL.

NO RULING.

3. [18-11651](#)-B-11 **IN RE: GREGORY TE VELDE**
[19-1033](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT
2-24-2021 [[163](#)]

SUGARMAN V. IRZ CONSULTING, LLC ET AL
KYLE SCIUCHETTI/ATTY. FOR PL.

NO RULING.

4. [18-11651](#)-B-11 **IN RE: GREGORY TE VELDE**
[19-1033](#) [MNG-5](#)

CONTINUED MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND/OR MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
4-25-2025 [[830](#)]

SUGARMAN V. IRZ CONSULTING, LLC ET AL
KYLE SCIUCHETTI/ATTY. FOR MV.

NO RULING.

5. [18-11651](#)-B-11 **IN RE: GREGORY TE VELDE**
[19-1037](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: NOTICE OF REMOVAL
7-23-2018 [[1](#)]

IRZ CONSULTING LLC V. TEVELDE ET AL
HAGOP BEDOYAN/ATTY. FOR PL.

NO RULING.

6. [24-12751](#)-B-11 **IN RE: BIKRAM SINGH AND HARSIMRAN SANDHU**
[24-1062](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
12-27-2024 [[1](#)]

AMERICAN AGCREDIT, FLCA ET AL V. SINGH ET AL
MICHAEL GOMEZ/ATTY. FOR PL.
CONT'D TO 10/29/25 PER ECF ORDER #22

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to October 29, 2025, at 11:00 a.m.

No order is required.

Pursuant to Stipulation of the parties approved by this court (Doc. #22), this matter is CONTINUED to October 29, 2025, at 11:00 a.m.

7. [24-12751](#)-B-11 **IN RE: BIKRAM SINGH AND HARSIMRAN SANDHU**
[24-1063](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
12-27-2024 [[1](#)]

FARM CREDIT SERVICES OF AMERICA, PCA V. SINGH ET AL
MICHAEL GOMEZ/ATTY. FOR PL.
CONT'D TO 10/30/25 PER ECF ORDER #17

After posting the original pre-hearing dispositions, the court has modified its intended ruling on this matter.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to October 29, 2025, at 11:00 a.m.

No order is required.

This matter is hereby CONTINUED to **October 29**, 2025, at 11:00 a.m. It was erroneously set to October 30, 2025, at 11:00 a.m. in a prior order of the court due to an error in the order submitted.

8. [23-10457](#)-B-11 **IN RE: MADERA COMMUNITY HOSPITAL**
[23-1024](#)

CONTINUED PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
5-11-2023 [[1](#)]

RUBIO V. MADERA COMMUNITY HOSPITAL
EILEEN GOLDSMITH/ATTY. FOR PL.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to September 18, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue the order.

This matter is hereby CONTINUED to Thursday, September 18, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. to be heard in conjunction with the hearing on the proposed settlement in this adversary.

9. [23-10457](#)-B-11 **IN RE: MADERA COMMUNITY HOSPITAL**
[23-1024](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
5-11-2023 [[1](#)]

RUBIO V. MADERA COMMUNITY HOSPITAL
EILEEN GOLDSMITH/ATTY. FOR PL.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to September 18, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue the order.

This matter is hereby CONTINUED to Thursday, September 18, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. to be heard in conjunction with the hearing on the proposed settlement in this adversary.