

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California

Honorable Ronald H. Sargis
Chief Bankruptcy Judge
Modesto, California

October 22, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.

1. 20-90349-E-11 HRH-1 PNC EQUIPMENT FINANCE, LLC VS.	R. MILLENNIUM TRANSPORT, INC. David Johnston	CONTINUED MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY 9-16-20 [93]
---	---	---

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

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

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor’s Attorney, Chapter 11 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on September 16, 2020. By the court’s calculation, 15 days’ notice was provided. 14 days’ notice is required.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Debtor, creditors, the Chapter 11 Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offer opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing, unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is XXXXX.

PNC Equipment Finance, LLC (“Movant”) seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an assets identified as:

1. 2014 Utility VS2 Trailer, with Thermo King SB 230 Refrigeration Unit, VIN ending in 6902,
2. 2014 Utility VS2 Trailer, with Thermo King SB 230 Refrigeration Unit VIN ending in 6901,
3. 2014 Utility VS2 Trailer, with Thermo King SB 230 Refrigeration Unit VIN ending in 6905,
4. 2014 Utility VS2 Trailer, with Thermo King SB 230 Refrigeration Unit VIN ending in 6903, and
5. 2014 Utility VS2 Trailer, with Thermo King SB 230 Refrigeration Unit VIN ending in 2719

(“Vehicles”). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Michael McGinley to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by R. Millennium Transport, Inc. (“Debtor”).

Movant argues Debtor has not made four post-petition payments, with a total of \$28,874.56 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration, Dckt. 95. Movant also provides evidence that there are three pre-petition payments in default, with a pre-petition arrearage of \$21,655.92. *Id.*

Expert Valuation Provided

Movant has also provided the declaration of Michael McGinley, Vice President of Litigation and Recovery for Movant. Mr. McGinley testifies, under penalty of perjury, the fair market value of the Trailers is \$28,000 each. Along with Mr. McGinley’s previous knowledge and experience, his opinion of value is based upon the Trailers’ original price, age and forecast of current market values, conversations with equipment vendors, and the industry-standard TruckPaper values.

Thus, as the Trailer with a VIN ending in 6901 was totaled, the total value of the remaining four Trailers is \$112,00.00.

DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$91,460.31 (Declaration, Dckt. 95), while the value of the Trailers is determined to be \$120,000.00, as stated in Schedules A/B and D filed by Debtor, which is more than the retail value as stated on the Expert Valuation.

Opposition Presented at the Hearing

The Debtor in Possession/Debtor requested, and the Movant concurred, that the hearing be continued to allow the parties to address these issues.

Additionally, that the stay be modified so that the insurance proceeds from a damaged trailer can be paid to Movant.

Counsel for the Debtor in Possession shall prepare and lodge with the court an order consistent with this ruling.

October 22, 2020 Hearing

At the hearing, **xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx**.

FINAL RULINGS

2. [19-90400-E-7](#)
[MMJ-1](#)

JUSTAN JOHNSON
Steve Altman

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
9-15-20 [88]

CAPITAL ONE AUTO FINANCE VS.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the October 22, 2020 hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 7 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on September 15, 2020. By the court's calculation, 37 days' notice was provided. 28 days' notice is required.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party's failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. *See Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record, there are no disputed material factual issues, and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.

Capital One Auto Finance, a division of Capital One, N.A. ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2017 Ford Fiesta SE Sedan 4D, VIN ending in 6119 ("Vehicle"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Walter Chikukwa to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Justan A. Johnson ("Debtor").

Movant argues Debtor has not made 12 post-petition payments, with a total of \$4,572.22 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration, Dckt. 90.

Movant has also provided a copy of the Kelley Blue Book Valuation Report for the Vehicle. The Report has been properly authenticated and is accepted as a market report or commercial publication generally relied on by the public or by persons in the automobile sale business. FED. R. EVID. 803(17).

DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$15,362.25 (Declaration, Dckt. 90). Debtor values the Vehicle at \$14,000, as stated in Schedules A/B and D filed by Debtor, whereas the KBB report values the Vehicle at \$8,882.00. Exhibit C, Dckt. 91.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1): Grant Relief for Cause

Whether there is cause under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to grant relief from the automatic stay is a matter within the discretion of a bankruptcy court and is decided on a case-by-case basis. *See J E Livestock, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (In re J E Livestock, Inc.)*, 375 B.R. 892 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2007) (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. 137, 140 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2003)) (explaining that granting relief is determined on a case-by-case basis because “cause” is not further defined in the Bankruptcy Code); *In re Silverling*, 179 B.R. 909 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1995), *aff’d sub nom. Silverling v. United States (In re Silverling)*, No. CIV. S-95-470 WBS, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4332 (E.D. Cal. 1996). While granting relief for cause includes a lack of adequate protection, there are other grounds. *See In re J E Livestock, Inc.*, 375 B.R. at 897 (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. at 140). The court maintains the right to grant relief from stay for cause when a debtor has not been diligent in carrying out his or her duties in the bankruptcy case, has not made required payments, or is using bankruptcy as a means to delay payment or foreclosure. *W. Equities, Inc. v. Harlan (In re Harlan)*, 783 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986); *Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis)*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). The court determines that cause exists for terminating the automatic stay, including defaults in post-petition payments that have come due. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2)

A debtor has no equity in property when the liens against the property exceed the property’s value. *Stewart v. Gurley*, 745 F.2d 1194, 1195 (9th Cir. 1984). Once a movant under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) establishes that a debtor or estate has no equity in property, it is the burden of the debtor or trustee to establish that the collateral at issue is necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(g)(2); *United Sav. Ass’n of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs. Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 375–76 (1988). Based upon the evidence submitted, the court determines that there is no equity in the Vehicle for either Debtor or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). This being a Chapter 7 case, the Vehicle is *per se* not necessary for an effective reorganization. *See Ramco Indus. v. Preuss (In re Preuss)*, 15 B.R. 896 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1981).

Prior Discharge

Debtor was granted a discharge in this case on May 5, 2020. Granting of a discharge to an individual in a Chapter 7 case terminates the automatic stay as to that debtor by operation of law, replacing it with the discharge injunction. *See* 11 U.S.C. §§ 362(c)(2)(C), 524(a)(2). There being no automatic stay, the Motion is denied as moot as to Debtor. The Motion is granted as to the Estate.

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow Movant, and its agents, representatives and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, to repossess, dispose of, or sell the asset pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, to obtain possession of the asset.

Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant requests that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States Supreme Court.

Movant has pleaded adequate facts and presented sufficient evidence to support the court waiving the fourteen-day stay of enforcement required under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3), and this part of the requested relief is granted.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Capital One Auto Finance, a division of Capital One, N.A. ("Movant") having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, under its security agreement, loan documents granting it a lien in the asset identified as a 2017 Ford Fiesta SE Sedan 4D, VIN ending in 6119 ("Vehicle"), and applicable nonbankruptcy law to obtain possession of, nonjudicially sell, and apply proceeds from the sale of the Vehicle to the obligation secured thereby.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that to the extent the Motion seeks relief from the automatic stay as to Justan A. Johnson ("Debtor"), the discharge having been granted in this case, the Motion is denied as moot pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(C) as to Debtor.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.

DAWNE MARINO VS.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the October 22, 2020 hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor’s Attorney, Chapter 7 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on September 17, 2020. By the court’s calculation, 35 days’ notice was provided. 28 days’ notice is required.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party’s failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). The defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.

Dawne Rachell Marino, Hayden Vincent Marino, Kelley Christine Birch, and Ethan Daniel Birch (“Movant”) seeks relief from the automatic stay to allow Movants to continue advancing a claim with Debtor’s automobile insurance carrier, State Farm. Movant has provided the Declaration of Jeffrey R. Smith to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Mechelle Renee Aschwanden (“Debtor”).

Movant argues that relief is needed so that Movant may seek compensation for damages caused by Debtor’s negligent operation of a vehicle on January 25, 2020. Declaration, Dckt. 19. Movants have advanced a claim with Debtor’s automobile insurance carrier, State Farm seeking damages within the \$15,000 / \$30,000 policy limits of Debtor’s insurance policy, and do not intend to seek compensation from Debtor personally, in the form of an excess judgment or personal contribution. *Id.*

DEBTOR’S RESPONSE

Debtor filed a Response on October 6, 2020 stating no opposition to Movant’s request for relief. Dckt. 26.

DISCUSSION

The court may grant relief from stay for cause when it is necessary to allow litigation in a nonbankruptcy court. 3 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 362.07[3][a] (Alan N. Resnick & Henry J. Sommer eds. 16th ed.). The moving party bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case that relief from the automatic stay is warranted, however. *LaPierre v. Advanced Med. Spa Inc. (In re Advanced Med. Spa Inc.)*, No. EC-16-1087, 2016 Bankr. LEXIS 2205, at *8–9 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. May 23, 2016). To determine “whether cause exists to allow litigation to proceed in another forum, ‘the bankruptcy court must balance the potential hardship that will be incurred by the party seeking relief if the stay is not lifted against the potential prejudice to the debtor and the bankruptcy estate.’” *Id.* at *9 (quoting *Green v. Brotman Med. Ctr., Inc. (In re Brotman Med. Ctr., Inc.)*, No. CC-08-1056-DKMo, 2008 Bankr. LEXIS 4692, at *6 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. Aug. 15, 2008)) (citing *In re Aleris Int’l, Inc.*, 456 B.R. 35, 47 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011)). The basis for such relief under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) when there is pending litigation in another forum is predicated on factors of judicial economy, including whether the suit involves multiple parties or is ready for trial. *See Christensen v. Tucson Estates, Inc. (In re Tucson Estates, Inc.)*, 912 F.2d 1162 (9th Cir. 1990); *Packerland Packing Co. v. Griffith Brokerage Co. (In re Kemble)*, 776 F.2d 802 (9th Cir. 1985); *Santa Clara Cty. Fair Ass’n v. Sanders (In re Santa Clara Cty. Fair Ass’n)*, 180 B.R. 564 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1995); *Truebro, Inc. v. Plumberex Specialty Prods., Inc. (In re Plumberex Specialty Prods., Inc.)*, 311 B.R. 551 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2004).

The court finds that the nature of the insurance claim warrants relief from stay for cause. Therefore, judicial economy dictates that the insurance claim be allowed to continue after the considerable time and resources put into the matter already.

The court shall issue an order modifying the automatic stay as it applies to Debtor to allow Movant to continue pursuing its claim for insurance proceeds with Debtor’s automobile insurance carrier. The automatic stay is not modified with respect to enforcement of the judgment against Debtor, Michael D. McGranahan (“the Chapter 7 Trustee”), or property of the bankruptcy estate. Any judgment obtained shall be submitted to this court for the proper treatment of any claims arising under the Bankruptcy Code.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

The court shall issue an order substantially in the following form holding that:

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Dawne Rachell Marino, Hayden Vincent Marino, Kelley Christine Birch, and Ethan Daniel Birch (“Movant”) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are modified as applicable to Mechelle Renee Aschwanden (“Debtor”) to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, to proceed with pursuing an insurance claim relating to the January 25, 2020 automobile accident described as occurring when “Ms. Aschwanden operated her 2008 Chevrolet Silverado on northbound State Route 99 in Ceres, California,” including filing and prosecuting to

a final judgment (including any appeals thereon) a State Court action as necessary to obtain payment of monies from insurance asserted to exist for the accident.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the automatic stay is not modified with respect to enforcement of any judgment against Debtor, Michael D. McGranahan (“the Chapter 7 Trustee”), or property of the bankruptcy estate. Any judgment obtained by Movant shall be submitted to this court for the proper treatment of any claims arising under the Bankruptcy Code.

No other or additional relief is granted.

BANK OF THE WEST VS.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the October 22, 2020 hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtors, Debtors Attorney, Chapter 7 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on September 23, 2020. By the court's calculation, 29 days' notice was provided. 28 days' notice is required.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party's failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. *See Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record, there are no disputed material factual issues, and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

<p>The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.</p>

Bank of the West ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to assets identified as:

1. 2018 Suntracker FB20 Boat, IDN ending in B818
2. Mercury Marine Motor, IDN ending in 3965, and
3. Trailstar Trailer, VIN ending in 3316

("Vehicles"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Aimee Nanon to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by William Langdon Rennie and Connie Sue Rennie ("Debtor").

Movant argues Debtor has not made one (1) post-petition payments, with a total of \$304.22 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration, Dckt. 13. Movant also provides evidence that there are two (2) pre-petition payments in default, with a pre-petition arrearage of \$606.72. *Id.*

DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$32,458.01 (Declaration, Dckt. 13), while the value of the Vehicle is determined to be \$15,610.00, as stated in Schedules A/B and D filed by Debtor.

According to the Statement of Intention, Debtor intends to surrender the Vehicles. Dckt. 1.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1): Grant Relief for Cause

Whether there is cause under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to grant relief from the automatic stay is a matter within the discretion of a bankruptcy court and is decided on a case-by-case basis. *See J E Livestock, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (In re J E Livestock, Inc.)*, 375 B.R. 892 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2007) (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. 137, 140 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2003)) (explaining that granting relief is determined on a case-by-case basis because “cause” is not further defined in the Bankruptcy Code); *In re Silverling*, 179 B.R. 909 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1995), *aff’d sub nom. Silverling v. United States (In re Silverling)*, No. CIV. S-95-470 WBS, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4332 (E.D. Cal. 1996). While granting relief for cause includes a lack of adequate protection, there are other grounds. *See In re J E Livestock, Inc.*, 375 B.R. at 897 (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. at 140). The court maintains the right to grant relief from stay for cause when a debtor has not been diligent in carrying out his or her duties in the bankruptcy case, has not made required payments, or is using bankruptcy as a means to delay payment or foreclosure. *W. Equities, Inc. v. Harlan (In re Harlan)*, 783 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986); *Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis)*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). The court determines that cause exists for terminating the automatic stay, including defaults in post-petition payments that have come due. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2)

A debtor has no equity in property when the liens against the property exceed the property’s value. *Stewart v. Gurley*, 745 F.2d 1194, 1195 (9th Cir. 1984). Once a movant under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) establishes that a debtor or estate has no equity in property, it is the burden of the debtor or trustee to establish that the collateral at issue is necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(g)(2); *United Sav. Ass’n of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs. Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 375–76 (1988). Based upon the evidence submitted, the court determines that there is no equity in the Vehicle for either Debtor or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). This being a Chapter 7 case, the Vehicle is *per se* not necessary for an effective reorganization. *See Ramco Indus. v. Preuss (In re Preuss)*, 15 B.R. 896 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1981).

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow Movant, and its agents, representatives and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, to repossess, dispose of, or sell the asset pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, to obtain possession of the asset.

Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant requests that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States Supreme Court.

Movant has pleaded adequate facts and presented sufficient evidence to support the court waiving the fourteen-day stay of enforcement required under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3), and this part of the requested relief is granted.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Bank of the West (“Movant”) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicles, under its security agreement, loan documents granting it a lien in the assets identified as:

1. 2018 Suntracker FB20 Boat, IDN ending in B818
2. Mercury Marine Motor, IDN ending in 3965,
3. Trailstar Trailer, VIN ending in 3316.

(“Vehicles”), and applicable nonbankruptcy law to obtain possession of, nonjudicially sell, and apply proceeds from the sale of the Vehicles to the obligation secured thereby.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.

U.S. BANK NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION VS.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the October 22, 2020 hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 7 Trustee, Co-Debtor, and Office of the United States Trustee on September 18, 2020. By the court's calculation, 34 days' notice was provided. 28 days' notice is required.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party's failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. *See Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record, there are no disputed material factual issues, and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.

U.S. Bank National Association ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2018 Jay Flight 324BDSW, VIN ending in 0182 ("Vehicle"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Javier Gonzalez to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Kevin J. Mendenhall ("Debtor").

Movant argues Debtor has not made one (1) post-petition payments, with a total of \$303.56 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration, Dckt. 18. Movant also provides evidence that there are four (4) pre-petition payments in default, with a pre-petition arrearage of \$1,207.70. *Id.*

DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$32,748.21 (Declaration, Dckt. 18), while the value of the Vehicle is determined to be \$25,000, as stated in Schedules A/B and D filed by Debtor.

According to the Statement of Intention, Debtor intends to surrender the Vehicle. Dckt. 1.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1): Grant Relief for Cause

Whether there is cause under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to grant relief from the automatic stay is a matter within the discretion of a bankruptcy court and is decided on a case-by-case basis. *See J E Livestock, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (In re J E Livestock, Inc.)*, 375 B.R. 892 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2007) (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. 137, 140 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2003)) (explaining that granting relief is determined on a case-by-case basis because “cause” is not further defined in the Bankruptcy Code); *In re Silverling*, 179 B.R. 909 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1995), *aff’d sub nom. Silverling v. United States (In re Silverling)*, No. CIV. S-95-470 WBS, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4332 (E.D. Cal. 1996). While granting relief for cause includes a lack of adequate protection, there are other grounds. *See In re J E Livestock, Inc.*, 375 B.R. at 897 (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. at 140). The court maintains the right to grant relief from stay for cause when a debtor has not been diligent in carrying out his or her duties in the bankruptcy case, has not made required payments, or is using bankruptcy as a means to delay payment or foreclosure. *W. Equities, Inc. v. Harlan (In re Harlan)*, 783 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986); *Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis)*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). The court determines that cause exists for terminating the automatic stay, including defaults in post-petition payments that have come due. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2)

A debtor has no equity in property when the liens against the property exceed the property’s value. *Stewart v. Gurley*, 745 F.2d 1194, 1195 (9th Cir. 1984). Once a movant under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) establishes that a debtor or estate has no equity in property, it is the burden of the debtor or trustee to establish that the collateral at issue is necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(g)(2); *United Sav. Ass’n of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs. Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 375–76 (1988). Based upon the evidence submitted, the court determines that there is no equity in the Vehicle for either Debtor or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). This being a Chapter 7 case, the Vehicle is *per se* not necessary for an effective reorganization. *See Ramco Indus. v. Preuss (In re Preuss)*, 15 B.R. 896 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1981).

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow Movant, and its agents, representatives and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, to repossess, dispose of, or sell the asset pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, to obtain possession of the asset.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by U.S. Bank National Association (“Movant”) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, under its security agreement, loan documents granting it a lien in the asset identified as a 2018 Jay Flight 324BDWS,

VIN ending in 0182 (“Vehicle”), and applicable nonbankruptcy law to obtain possession of, nonjudicially sell, and apply proceeds from the sale of the Vehicle to the obligation secured thereby.

No other or additional relief is granted.