

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

September 29, 2014 at 1:30 p.m.

THIS CALENDAR IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS. THEREFORE, TO FIND ALL MOTIONS AND OBJECTIONS SET FOR HEARING IN A PARTICULAR CASE, YOU MAY HAVE TO LOOK IN BOTH PARTS OF THE CALENDAR. WITHIN EACH PART, CASES ARE ARRANGED BY THE LAST TWO DIGITS OF THE CASE NUMBER.

THE COURT FIRST WILL HEAR ITEMS 1 THROUGH 9. A TENTATIVE RULING FOLLOWS EACH OF THESE ITEMS. THE COURT MAY AMEND OR CHANGE A TENTATIVE RULING BASED ON THE PARTIES' ORAL ARGUMENT. IF ALL PARTIES AGREE TO A TENTATIVE RULING, THERE IS NO NEED TO APPEAR FOR ARGUMENT. HOWEVER, IT IS INCUMBENT ON EACH PARTY TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER ALL OTHER PARTIES WILL ACCEPT A RULING AND FOREGO ORAL ARGUMENT. IF A PARTY APPEARS, THE HEARING WILL PROCEED WHETHER OR NOT ALL PARTIES ARE PRESENT. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE HEARING, THE COURT WILL ANNOUNCE ITS DISPOSITION OF THE ITEM AND IT MAY DIRECT THAT THE TENTATIVE RULING, AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN OR AS AMENDED BY THE COURT, BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES OF THE HEARING AS THE COURT'S FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

IF A MOTION OR AN OBJECTION IS SET FOR HEARING PURSUANT TO LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3015-1(c), (d) [eff. May 1, 2012], GENERAL ORDER 05-03, ¶ 3(c), LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3007-1(c)(2) [eff. through April 30, 2012], OR LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 9014-1(f)(2), RESPONDENTS WERE NOT REQUIRED TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION TO THE RELIEF REQUESTED. RESPONDENTS MAY APPEAR AT THE HEARING AND RAISE OPPOSITION ORALLY. IF THAT OPPOSITION RAISES A POTENTIALLY MERITORIOUS DEFENSE OR ISSUE, THE COURT WILL GIVE THE RESPONDENT AN OPPORTUNITY TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION AND SET A FINAL HEARING UNLESS THERE IS NO NEED TO DEVELOP THE WRITTEN RECORD FURTHER. IF THE COURT SETS A FINAL HEARING, UNLESS THE PARTIES REQUEST A DIFFERENT SCHEDULE THAT IS APPROVED BY THE COURT, THE FINAL HEARING WILL TAKE PLACE ON OCTOBER 27, 2014 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY OCTOBER 14, 2014, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY OCTOBER 20, 2014. THE MOVING/OBJECTING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE DATE AND TIME OF THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE AND OF THESE DEADLINES.

THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON ITEMS 10 THROUGH 39 IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CALENDAR. INSTEAD, THESE ITEMS HAVE BEEN DISPOSED OF AS INDICATED IN THE FINAL RULING BELOW. THAT RULING WILL BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES. THIS FINAL RULING MAY OR MAY NOT BE A FINAL ADJUDICATION ON THE MERITS; IF IT IS, IT INCLUDES THE COURT'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. IF ALL PARTIES HAVE AGREED TO A CONTINUANCE OR HAVE RESOLVED THE MATTER BY STIPULATION, THEY MUST ADVISE THE COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK PRIOR TO HEARING IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE COURT VACATE THE FINAL RULING IN FAVOR OF THE CONTINUANCE OR THE STIPULATED DISPOSITION.

IF THE COURT CONCLUDES THAT FED. R. BANKR. P. 9014(d) REQUIRES AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING, UNLESS OTHERWISE ORDERED, IT WILL BE SET ON OCTOBER 6, 2014, AT 2:30 P.M.

September 29, 2014 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1.	14-27909-A-13 JUAN/REINA TORRES JPJ-1	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 9-10-14 [25]
----	--	--

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

First, the debtor owes a domestic support obligation. Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(b)(6) provides:

"The debtor shall provide to the trustee, not later than the fourteen (14) days after the filing of the petition, Form EDC 3-088, *Domestic Support Obligation Checklist*, or other written notice of the name and address of each person to whom the debtor owes a domestic support obligation together with the name and address of the relevant state child support enforcement agency (see 42 U.S.C. §§ 464 & 466), Form EDC 3-086, *Class 1 Checklist*, for each Class 1 claim, and Form EDC 3-087, *Authorization to Release Information to Trustee Regarding Secured Claims Being Paid By The Trustee*."

The debtor failed to deliver to the trustee the Domestic Support Obligation Checklist. This checklist is designed to assist the trustee in giving the notices required by 11 U.S.C. § 1302(d).

The trustee must provide a written notice both to the holder of a claim for a domestic support obligation and to the state child support enforcement agency. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1302(d)(1)(A) & (B). The state child support enforcement agency is the agency established under sections 464 and 466 of the Social Security Act. See 42 U.S.C. §§ 664 & 666. Section 1302(d)(1)(C) requires a third, post-discharge notice to both the claim holder and the state child support enforcement agency.

The trustee's notice to the claimant must: (a) advise the holder that he or she is owed a domestic support obligation; (b) advise the holder of the right to use the services of the state child support enforcement agency for assistance in collecting such claim; and (c) include the address and telephone number of the state child support enforcement agency.

The trustee's notice to the State child support enforcement agency required by section 1302(d)(1)(B) must: (a) advise the agency of such claim; and (b) advise the agency of the name, address and telephone number of the holder of such claim.

By failing to provide the checklist to the trustee, the debtor has disregarded the rule that it be provided, has breached the duty to cooperate with the trustee imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

Second, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Santander Consumer USA in order to strip down or strip off its secured claim from its collateral. No such motion has been filed, served, and granted. Absent a successful motion the debtor cannot establish that the plan will pay secured claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) or that the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(j) provides: "If a proposed plan will reduce or eliminate a secured claim based on the value of its collateral or the avoidability of a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f), the debtor must file, serve, and set for hearing a valuation motion and/or a lien avoidance motion. The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

2. 14-29112-A-13 ALVIN CHANDRA MOTION TO
MET-1 EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY
9-13-14 [8]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted.

This is the second bankruptcy case filed by the debtor. A prior case, Case No. 14-28279, was dismissed on September 2, 2014 because the debtor failed to file all schedules and statements. The debtor was acting without an attorney. The docket for the case does not indicate any creditor took action because of the filing of the earlier case.

11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(A) provides that if a single or joint case is filed by or against a debtor who is an individual in a case under chapter 7, 11, or 13, and if a single or joint case of the debtor was pending within the preceding one-year period but was dismissed, the automatic stay with respect to a debt,

property securing such debt, or any lease terminates on the 30th day after the filing of the new case.

Section 362(c)(3)(B) allows a debtor to file a motion requesting the continuation of the stay. A review of the docket reveals that the debtor has filed this motion to extend the automatic stay before the 30th day after the filing of the petition. The motion will be adjudicated before the 30-day period expires.

In order to extend the automatic stay, the party seeking the relief must demonstrate that the filing of the new case was in good faith as to the creditors to be stayed. For example, in In re Whitaker, 341 B.R. 336, 345 (Bankr. S.D. Ga. 2006), the court held: "[T]he chief means of rebutting the presumption of bad faith requires the movant to establish 'a substantial change in the financial or personal affairs of the debtor . . . or any other reason to conclude' that the instant case will be successful. If the instant case is one under chapter 7, a discharge must now be permissible. If it is a case under chapters 11 or 13, there must be some substantial change."

Here, it appears that the debtor failed to file all documents because he was without representation. This case was filed with the assistance of an attorney and all schedules, statements and a plan have been filed. This is a sufficient change in circumstances rebut the presumption of bad faith.

3. 14-28319-A-13 SHEVON BAILEY-TAYLOR MOTION TO
CA-1 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. REAL TIME SCANNABLE 9-15-14 [15]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$198,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$304,667.38 as of the petition date. Therefore, Real Time Scannable's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re

Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$198,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

4. 14-26424-A-13 KAROLYN MOTION TO
SJS-1 JOHNSON-LOUDERMILK CONFIRM PLAN
8-12-14 [21]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be granted and the objection will be overruled.

The plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

As to the Class 1 claim owed to the objecting creditor, the plan provides for the maintenance of ongoing payments and the cure of the pre-petition arrears. This comports with the requirements of 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2), (5). While the plan may understate the arrears claimed by the creditor, it is the amount claimed, not the estimate in the plan, that will dictate what is paid to the creditor.

5. 14-27939-A-13 ELIZABETH ARMAS OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
9-10-14 [21]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

First, the debtor has failed to give the trustee financial records for a closely held business. This is a breach of the duties imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Second, 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(B) & (C) requires the court to dismiss a petition if an individual chapter 7 or 13 debtor fails to provide to the case trustee a copy of the debtor's federal income tax return for the most recent tax year ending before the filing of the petition. This return must be produced seven days prior to the date first set for the meeting of creditors. The failure to provide the return to the trustee justifies dismissal and denial of confirmation. In addition to the requirement of section 521(e)(2) that the petition be dismissed, an uncodified provision of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 found at section 1228(a) of BAPCPA provides that in chapter 11 and 13 cases the court shall not confirm a plan of an individual debtor unless requested tax documents have been turned over. This has not been done.

Third, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting motions to value the collateral of Wells Fargo and Green Tree Servicing in order to strip down or strip off their secured claims from their collateral. No such motions have been filed, served, and granted. Absent successful motions the debtor cannot establish that the plan will pay secured claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) or that the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(j) provides: "If a proposed plan will reduce or eliminate a secured claim based on the value of its collateral or the avoidability of a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f), the debtor must file, serve, and set for hearing a valuation motion and/or a lien avoidance motion. The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

Fourth, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b) because it neither pays unsecured creditors in full nor pays them all of the debtor's projected disposable income. The plan will pay nothing to unsecured creditors but Form 22 shows that the debtor will have \$27,131.14 over the next five years.

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

6.	14-27939-A-13 ELIZABETH ARMAS SW-1 WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. VS.	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN 8-22-14 [16]
----	---	--

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be overruled.

The objection asserts that the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) because it does not propose to pay the objecting creditor the present value of its collateral. The plan estimates this value to be \$12,852 but the creditor asserts that it is \$19,100. However, the debtor has not moved to value the collateral. In the absence of such a motion, it is the proof of claim that governs the amount of the claim, not the estimate in the plan. See Section 2.04 of the proposed plan.

7. 14-27961-A-13 GASOLO TAWAKE
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
9-10-14 [30]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

First, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of \$3,725 is less than the \$4,086 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

Second, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The petition conceals from parties in interest that the debtor filed an earlier chapter 13 case in 2013. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

8. 13-21871-A-13 LAWRENCE MASSA
MRL-1

MOTION TO
WITHDRAW AS ATTORNEY
9-9-14 [45]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the attorney for the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the debtor, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition

to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted on the conditions stated below.

Apparently, differences have arisen between counsel and client that both recognize make it impossible for counsel to continue. A review of the docket reveals no pending matters. Therefore, withdrawal will be permitted but counsel shall: (1) return all of the debtor's records and property within 7 days of the hearing; (2) provide the debtor with a complete copy of his file within 7 days of the hearing; (3) file withing 14 days of the hearing, then serve and set the motion for a hearing, a motion to finally approve compensation paid and to be paid to counsel. This is required even if the court has previously allowed compensation on any basis. At the hearing the court will determine if compensation previously awarded is improvident in light of subsequent developments and whether additional compensation is warranted.

9.	14-27897-A-13 PATRICIA FIORENTINO JHW-1 CAB WEST, L.L.C. VS.	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN 8-28-14 [15]
----	---	--

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be overruled.

The objecting creditor leases a vehicle to the debtor. It asserts that the plan cannot be confirmed because it neither assumes nor rejects the unexpired lease. See 11 U.S.C. § 365. The objection is without merit.

First, nothing in 11 U.S.C. § 1322 requires that a plan assume or reject an unexpired lease. Section 1322(b)(7) provides only that a plan may provide for the assumption or rejection of a lease.

Second, the objection is factually incorrect. The plan provides at section 3.01 that unexpired leases not listed in the plan are rejected.

THE FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

10. 14-27901-A-13 ALEJANDRO/JOANN REYES ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE
9-5-14 [33]

Final Ruling: The order to show cause will be discharged and the case will remain pending.

The court granted the debtor permission to pay the filing fee in installments. The debtor failed to pay the \$77 installment when due on September 2. However, after the issuance of the order to show cause, the delinquent installment was paid. No prejudice was caused by the late payment.

11. 14-23102-A-13 ANGELA SKELLENGER MOTION FOR
APN-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
HYUNDAI LEASE TILTING TRUST VS. 8-28-14 [36]

Final Ruling: This motion for relief from the automatic stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the debtor and the trustee to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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.

The motion will be dismissed because it is moot.

The movant is the owner of a vehicle leased to the debtor. The debtor has not made approximately four monthly lease payments since the bankruptcy case was filed. However, there is a confirmed plan in this case and that plan provides that leases not specifically assumed by the plan are rejected. This lease is not assumed by the plan and so it has been rejected. Further, whether a lease is assumed or rejected, section 3.02 of the plan provides: "Upon confirmation of the plan, all bankruptcy stays are modified to allow the nondebtor party to an unexpired lease to obtain possession of leased property, to dispose of it under applicable law, and to exercise its rights against any nondebtor in the event of a default under applicable law or contract."

Hence, there is no automatic stay to terminate or modify. This motion was unnecessary.

The court awards no fees and costs. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

12. 14-28306-A-13 KRISTINA BRECKENRIDGE MOTION TO
WW-1 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. SOUTHSTAR FUNDING, L.L.C. 8-28-14 [17]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$240,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Wells Fargo Home Mortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$248,683 as of the petition date. Therefore, Southstar Funding, LLC's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$240,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

13. 14-27217-A-13 MICHAEL POWELL AND MOTION TO
LBG-1 DEBORAH SENNECA VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. 8-21-14 [21]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$490,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Bank of America, N.A. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$538,319 as of the petition date. Therefore, Bank of America, N.A.'s other claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$490,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

14. 14-26819-A-13 WILLIAM WAY
JLK-1
VS. U.S. BANK

MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL
8-14-14 [15]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$215,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Greentree Servicing. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$279,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, U.S. Bank's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule

3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$215,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

15. 12-28622-A-13 TERRY JACQUES MOTION TO
WW-2 INCUR DEBT
8-29-14 [29]

Final Ruling: This motion to borrow has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(b) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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 debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion to borrow sufficient money to, among other things, fund a lump sum payment that will conclude the plan, will be granted on condition that a modified plan permitting a lump sum payment is first approved by the court.

16. 12-28622-A-13 TERRY JACQUES MOTION TO
WW-3 MODIFY PLAN
8-29-14 [33]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d) requires that a motion to modify a chapter 13 plan, either before or after confirmation of a plan, be noticed for hearing exclusively pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1).

Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-(f)(1) permits motions to be set on 28 days of notice and it also requires that written opposition be filed 14 days prior to the hearing. Rule 9014-1 allows this notice "unless additional notice is required by the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure. . . ."

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3015(g) requires a minimum of 21 days of notice of the deadline for objections to confirmation as well as the hearing on confirmation of the plan. If Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) requires that written opposition be filed 14 days prior to the hearing but Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g) requires 21 days of notice of the deadline for filing opposition, then the debtor must give

17. 14-25729-A-13 ROMUALDO TAVORA
CA-3

September 29, 2014 at 1:30 p.m.
- Page 16 -

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$108,840. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

19.	14-27232-A-13	SPENCER/VANESSA	MOTION TO
	SAC-1	GRIMENSTEIN	VALUE COLLATERAL
	VS. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION		8-26-14 [22]

Final Ruling: The court continues the hearing to November 24, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. in order to give the respondent time to obtain an appraisal and file

opposition. The appraisal and opposition shall be filed and served no later than November 10. The debtor's reply shall be filed and served no later than November 17. The respondent's request for an evidentiary hearing is denied without prejudice. No evidentiary hearing will be held unless there is a material disputed fact in the record. Until the respondent has filed opposition, it cannot be ascertained whether there is a material disputed fact.

20. 14-27232-A-13 SPENCER/VANESSA MOTION TO
SAC-2 GRIMENSTEIN VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. ROBERT BUNBURY 8-26-14 [26]

Final Ruling: The court continues the hearing to November 24, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. so that it will coincide with the hearing on the related motion to value the SBA's interest in the same property. By continuing the hearing, the court is not granting additional time for any party in interest to file further support or opposition to the motion. The debtor shall give notice of the continuance.

21. 14-27232-A-13 SPENCER/VANESSA MOTION TO
SAC-3 GRIMENSTEIN VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. 8-26-14 [30]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$680,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Suntrust Mortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$715,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.'s claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$680,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

The motion goes to some effort to explain that the obligation owed to the respondent was discharged in an earlier bankruptcy case. Assuming this is true, this had no impact on the respondent's lien or the value of its collateral. Therefore, it holds a claim in this case - its debt is secured, at least nominally, by a lien on property of the estate. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 101(5), (10), (12), 506(a)(1), 524(a), (j).

22. 14-27232-A-13 SPENCER/VANESSA
SAC-4 GRIMENSTEIN
VS. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.

MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL
8-26-14 [34]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$680,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Suntrust Mortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$715,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.'s claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Barte, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an

adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$680,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

The motion goes to some effort to explain that the obligation owed to the respondent was discharged in an earlier bankruptcy case. Assuming this is true, this had no impact on the respondent's lien or the value of its collateral. Therefore, it holds a claim in this case - its debt is secured, at least nominally, by a lien on property of the estate. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 101(5), (10), (12), 506(a)(1), 524(a), (j).

23. 10-42534-A-13 CECILIA PEREZ
PGM-4

MOTION TO
MODIFY PLAN
8-20-14 [51]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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 debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The case will be dismissed.

This case was filed on August 20, 2014 without all schedules, statements and a proposed plan. The clerk issued a notice that the case would be dismissed on September 3, 2014 unless the documents were filed, an extension granted, or a hearing was set on the clerk's notice. The documents were not filed and no extension was requested. Instead, a creditor, Butte County, filed opposition to the dismissal. However, it has no opposition to a dismissal as long as the court first considers its motion for relief from the automatic stay.

Because dismissal will cause the automatic stay to expire as provided in 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(1) and (2), and because the court continues to have jurisdiction to enter orders concerning the automatic stay even after the dismissal of the case, the opposition is without merit.

Final Ruling: This motion for relief from the automatic stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the debtor and the trustee to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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.

The motion will be granted in part.

To the extent the motion seeks the termination of the stay, the motion will be dismissed because the stay has expired upon the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(1) and (2).

The motion will be granted insofar as it asks for prospective relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4).

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) provides that:

"On request of a party in interest and after notice and a hearing, the court shall grant relief from the stay provided under subsection (a) of this section, such as by terminating, annulling, modifying, or conditioning such stay . . .

with respect to a stay of an act against real property under subsection (a), by a creditor whose claim is secured by an interest in such real property, if the court finds that the filing of the petition was part of a scheme to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors that involved either-

(A) transfer of all or part ownership of, or other interest in, such real property without the consent of the secured creditor or court approval; or

(B) multiple bankruptcy filings affecting such real property."

Section 362(d)(4) implicates 11 U.S.C. § 362(b)(20). Section 362(b)(20) is an "in rem" exception to the automatic stay. If the court grants relief in this case under section 362(d)(4), but then another petition is filed by any debtor who claims an interest in the subject real property, section 362(b)(20) provides that the automatic stay does not operate in the second case so as to prevent the enforcement of a lien or security interest in the subject real property. The exception to the automatic stay in the second case is effective for 2 years after the entry of the order under section 362(d)(4) in the first case.

A debtor in the subsequent bankruptcy case, however, may move for relief from the in rem order. The request for relief from the in rem order may be premised upon "changed circumstances or for other good cause shown. . . ."

Here, the county has been attempting to conduct tax sales on four parcels of real property owned by the debtor. Each time a sale is scheduled, the debtor files a chapter 13 petition which he then fails to prosecute. The case is dismissed and then the process is repeated. This has now happened six times. This case is no different than the earlier cases. It was filed on August 20, two days before a tax sale, the schedules, statements and plan were due on September 3 and then not filed. To make matters worse, this case conceals the prior cases by not disclosing them as required by the petition.

The court concludes that the purpose of these successive bankruptcy cases is acquire the automatic stay without any intention of reorganizing under chapter 13. These facts evidence a clear scheme to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors by filing successive bankruptcy cases.

Therefore, the court will grant relief from the automatic stay that will be effective for a period of two years in any future case filed by anyone claiming an interest in the subject property, provided the recordation requirements of section 362(d)(4) are satisfied by the movant or its successor.

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be waived. The court awards no fees and costs.

26.	14-26948-A-13	ROBERT/MOIRA TRABERT	MOTION TO
	MLA-1		CONFIRM PLAN
			8-18-14 [37]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed because it is moot. The case was dismissed on August 18, 2014.

27.	14-24958-A-13	JEOFFREY/ROSEMARIE	MOTION FOR
	GLH-1	BALDOVINO	RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT OR ORDER
			8-30-14 [67]

Final Ruling: This motion for relief from an order valuing collateral has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the debtor and the trustee to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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.

The court will vacate the order valuing the debtor's residence. It concludes that the city's failure to file written opposition to the motion was the result of excusable neglect (the misplacement of the motion in a stack of unrelated papers), the city took reason effort to correct its error prior to the granting of the motion and then promptly set a motion for hearing to vacate the valuation order, and its evidence suggests that it has a meritorious defense to the motion.

Therefore, an order shall be lodged vacating the July 14 valuation order, setting a further hearing on the valuation motion on November 24, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. If the debtor wishes to file further evidence in support of that motion it shall be filed and served no later than October 27. The city's opposition to the motion shall be filed and served no later than November 10. The debtor's reply shall be filed and served no later than November 17.

28. 14-24958-A-13 JEOFFREY/ROSEMARIE MOTION TO
HDR-4 BALDOVINO CONFIRM PLAN
8-8-14 [56]

Final Ruling: The court continues the hearing to November 24 at 1:30 p.m. so that it will coincide with the hearing on a related valuation motion. Any deadline set by the court to confirm a plan is extended accordingly.

29. 13-35464-A-13 CHRISTOPHER/AMBER SMITH OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CLAIM
VS. PREMIER BANKCARD/CHARTER 8-13-14 [23]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Premier Bankcard/Charger has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained. The last date to file a timely proof of claim was April 2, 2014. The proof of claim was filed on April 23, 2014. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(9) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002(c), the claim is disallowed because it is untimely. See In re Osborne, 76 F.3d 306 (9th Cir. 1996); In re Edelman, 237 B.R. 146, 153 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1999); Ledlin v. United States (In re Tomlan), 907 F.2d 114 (9th Cir. 1989); Zidell, Inc. V. Forsch (In re Coastal Alaska), 920 F.2d 1428, 1432-33 (9th Cir. 1990).

30. 13-35464-A-13 CHRISTOPHER/AMBER SMITH OBJECTION TO
JPJ-2 CLAIM
VS. JEFFERSON CAPITAL SYSTEMS, L.L.C. 8-13-14 [27]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Jefferson Capital

Systems has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection is sustained. The creditor has filed two different proofs of claim for the same debt on March 25, 2014. The second proof of claim does not indicate that it is amending or replacing the earlier proof of claim. However, from the information in the proofs of claim, it is clear that they are duplicative. Therefore, the second proof of claim is disallowed without prejudice to the first.

31.	13-35774-A-13 CORY MADISON JPJ-2 VS. WELLS FARGO BANK	OBJECTION TO CLAIM 8-13-14 [36]
-----	---	---------------------------------------

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Wells Fargo Bank has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained. The last date to file a timely proof of claim was May 14, 2014. The proof of claim was filed on June 11, 2014. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(9) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002(c), the claim is disallowed because it is untimely. See In re Osborne, 76 F.3d 306 (9th Cir. 1996); In re Edelman, 237 B.R. 146, 153 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1999); Ledlin v. United States (In re Tomlan), 907 F.2d 114 (9th Cir. 1989); Zidell, Inc. V. Forsch (In re Coastal Alaska), 920 F.2d 1428, 1432-33 (9th Cir. 1990).

32.	14-27476-C-13 EDUARDO/MARIE ORTEGA MAS-2 ROBERT GUERRA VS.	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN 9-10-14 [34]
-----	--	--

Final Ruling: This case was previously transferred to Judge Klein. If the movant has not already done so, this objection should be renoticed for a hearing before Judge Klein.

33.	14-27284-A-13 ANDREW/ROWENA CHAMP DJC-1 VS. CAPITAL ONE BANK (USA), N.A.	MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL 8-26-14 [17]
-----	--	---

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$1,500 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$1,500 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$1,500 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

34.	14-27284-A-13	ANDREW/ROWENA CHAMP	MOTION TO
	DJC-2		VALUE COLLATERAL
	VS. CAPITAL ONE BANK (USA), N.A.		8-26-14 [21]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$2,000 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$2,000 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$2,000 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

35.	14-27284-A-13	ANDREW/ROWENA CHAMP	MOTION TO
	DJC-3		VALUE COLLATERAL
	VS. SUZUKI MOTOR OF AMERICA, INC.		8-26-14 [25]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered

as consent 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$5,000 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$5,000 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$5,000 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

36.	13-26985-A-13 MANUEL ARCH JPJ-1 VS. WELLS FARGO HOME MORTGAGE	OBJECTION TO CLAIM 8-13-14 [38]
-----	--	---------------------------------------

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Wells Fargo Home Mortgage has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained. The last date to file a timely proof of claim was September 25, 2013. The proof of claim was filed on June 27, 2014. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(9) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002(c), the claim is disallowed because it is untimely. See In re Osborne, 76 F.3d 306 (9th Cir. 1996); In re Edelman, 237 B.R. 146, 153 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1999); Ledlin v. United States (In re Tomlan), 907 F.2d 114 (9th Cir. 1989); Zidell, Inc. V. Forsch (In re Coastal Alaska), 920 F.2d 1428, 1432-33 (9th Cir. 1990).

37.	13-26985-A-13 MANUEL ARCH JPJ-2 VS. WELLS FARGO HOME MORTGAGE	OBJECTION TO CLAIM 8-13-14 [42]
-----	--	---------------------------------------

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Wells Fargo Home Mortgage has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the

objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained. The last date to file a timely proof of claim was September 25, 2013. The proof of claim was filed on June 27, 2014. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(9) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002(c), the claim is disallowed because it is untimely. See In re Osborne, 76 F.3d 306 (9th Cir. 1996); In re Edelman, 237 B.R. 146, 153 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1999); Ledlin v. United States (In re Tomlan), 907 F.2d 114 (9th Cir. 1989); Zidell, Inc. V. Forsch (In re Coastal Alaska), 920 F.2d 1428, 1432-33 (9th Cir. 1990).

38. 13-23786-A-13 MARK/LINDA HOLT OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CLAIM
VS. RETAILERS' CREDIT ASSOC. OF GRASS 8-13-14 [49]
VALLEY/SIERRA NEVADA HOSP.

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Retailers' Credit Association, etc., has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained. The last date to file a timely proof of claim was July 24, 2013. The proof of claim was filed on June 26, 2014. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(9) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002(c), the claim is disallowed because it is untimely. See In re Osborne, 76 F.3d 306 (9th Cir. 1996); In re Edelman, 237 B.R. 146, 153 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1999); Ledlin v. United States (In re Tomlan), 907 F.2d 114 (9th Cir. 1989); Zidell, Inc. V. Forsch (In re Coastal Alaska), 920 F.2d 1428, 1432-33 (9th Cir. 1990).

39. 14-24691-A-13 MICHAEL LAMB AND MARGARET MOTION TO
PGM-1 LEDOUX-LAMB CONFIRM PLAN
8-8-14 [63]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(3) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent 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 debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.