

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

November 13, 2017 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 18. 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 DECEMBER 11, 2017 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY NOVEMBER 27, 2017, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 4, 2017. 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 19 THROUGH 28 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 NOVEMBER 20, 2017, AT 2:30 P.M.

November 13, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | 17-25600-A-13 REBECCA ROBINSON JPJ-1 | OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 10-11-17 [20] |
|----|---|---|

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, 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.

Second, 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 even though Form 122C shows that the debtor will have \$63,192.60 in projected disposable income 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.

- | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|
| 2. | 16-25623-A-13 JOHN ANDRADE SLH-2 VS. DEUTSCHE BANK NAT'L TRUST CO. | OBJECTION TO CLAIM 6-5-17 [51] |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: None. Given the numerous factual disputes, the court will treat this objection as an adversary proceeding and set an evidentiary hearing.

3. 17-26025-A-13 PATRICIA SHIELDS
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
10-25-17 [20]

- ☐ 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 conditionally denied.

First, in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv) and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1(c) the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition. The withholding of this financial information from the trustee is a breach of the duties imposed upon the debtor by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4) and the attempt to confirm a plan while withholding this relevant financial information is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Second, 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).

Third, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The statement of financial affairs fails to disclose the income of a partner and the debtor's interest in a business. 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.

4. 17-23829-A-13 EDWIN/SUSAN HATCH
JRH-2

MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
9-29-17 [61]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied and the objection sustained.

The plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of U.S. Bank 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."

5. 17-26129-A-13 NICHOLE MORGAN
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
10-25-17 [14]

- ☐ 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 conditionally denied.

First, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of \$3,991 is less than the \$4,133.90 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

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. 16-22739-A-13 JOEY/SHEILA NUQUI MOTION TO
CYB-2 MODIFY PLAN
9-29-17 [34]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied and the objection sustained.

Even though 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) prevents the proposed plan from modifying a claim secured only by the debtor's home, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) & (b)(5) permit the plan to provide for the cure of any defaults on such a claim while ongoing installment payments are maintained. The cure of defaults is not limited to the cure of pre-petition defaults. See In re Bellinger, 179 B.R. 220 (Bankr. D. Idaho 1995). The proposed plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the post-petition arrears owed to the Class 1 home loan. By failing to provide for a cure, the debtor is, in effect, impermissibly modifying a home loan. Also, the failure to cure the default means that the Class 1 secured claim will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

7. 17-23942-A-13 JENNIFER FORBES MOTION TO
RAH-1 CONFIRM PLAN
9-29-17 [25]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied and the objection sustained.

First, the debtor has failed to file a plan. While a plan may have been attached to the motion, no plan has been filed and docketed as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1321 and Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d).

Second, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of \$844.62 is less than the \$3,741.41 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

Third, because the plan payment is less than the ongoing mortgage payment due each month to the Class 1 home lender, a post-petition arrears has accumulated since the case was filed. The proposed plan does not cure this arrearage. 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) & (b)(5) permit the plan to provide for the cure of any defaults on such a claim while ongoing installment payments are maintained. The cure of defaults is not limited to the cure of pre-petition defaults. See In re Bellinger, 179 B.R. 220 (Bankr. D. Idaho 1995). The proposed plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the arrears owed to the Class 1 home loan. By failing to provide for a cure, the debtor is, in effect, impermissibly modifying a home loan in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2). Also, the failure to cure the default means that the Class 1 secured claim will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

Fourth, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Cal HFA Mortgage Assistance Corp. 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."

Fifth, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 600 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d) by 45 years.

Sixth, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(b)(6) provides: "Documents Required by Trustee. 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*." Because the plan includes a class 1 claim, the debtor was required to provide the trustee with a Class 1 checklist. The debtor failed to do so.

8. 17-26052-A-13 TANISHA MAVY
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
10-26-17 [41]

- ☐ 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 sustained.

First, the debtor's exemptions are defective on their face given the failure to claim a finite exemption amount. Without exemptions, unsecured creditors would receive a dividend of more than \$13,000 in a chapter 7 case. Therefore, the provision in the plan for no dividend to these creditors means the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4).

Second, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Universal Acceptance Corporation 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."

Third, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Schedules I/J show that the debtor will have monthly net income of approximately \$220; the plan requires a monthly payment of \$300.

Fourth, the certificate of service indicates the plan and the motion were served only 18 days prior to the hearing. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(b) requires 28 days' notice of both the hearing and the deadline for objections.

9. 15-26254-A-13 TIMOTHY/ROBIN PEPPEL MOTION TO
CYB-2 APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTORS'
ATTORNEY
10-13-17 [49]

- ☐ 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 seeks approval of \$2,825 in additional fees incurred principally in connection with a dispute concerning a mortgage claim that had accelerated. This necessitated a plan modification moving the claim from Class 1 to Class 2. Counsel also dealt with a motion for relief from the automatic stay by another home lender and with multiple notices of default from the trustee. The foregoing represents reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan in a manner consistent with the plan and Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1, if applicable.

10. 17-25865-A-13 MATTHEW CHRISTOPHER OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
10-25-17 [28]

- ☐ 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 conditionally denied.

The debtor has not proven the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). The plan assumes that a home lender has agreed to a home loan modification. Absent that agreement, the claim cannot be modified. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2). Instead, the debtor is limited to curing any pre-petition default while maintaining the regular monthly mortgage installment. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(5).

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.

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---|
| 11. | 17-25967-A-13 SUSAN WEISS JPJ-1 | OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 10-25-17 [19] |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---|

- ☐ 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 conditionally denied.

First, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(b)(6) provides: "Documents Required by Trustee. 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*." Because the plan includes a class 1 claim, the debtor was required to provide the trustee with a Class 1 checklist. The debtor failed to do so.

Second, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because

the monthly plan payment of \$1,375 is less than the \$1,425 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

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.

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 12. | 17-25967-A-13 SUSAN WEISS AP-1 U.S. BANK, N.A. | OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN 10-5-17 [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 plan provides for the objecting creditor's claim in Class 1. This means that the plan will cure the pre-petition arrearage while maintaining the monthly contract installment. The plan explicitly provides that the claim is not modified in any way. This treatment satisfies the requirements of 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(2), (b)(5), and 1325(a)(5)(B). The fact that the plan may erroneously understate the amount of the arrears by approximately \$1,200 is not important because the amount demanded by the creditor in its claim, not the amount stated in the plan, will be paid. See sections 2.04, 2.08(c) of proposed plan.

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 13. | 13-36174-A-13 PEAIR TAITT AND SILVIA SS-4 TORRES | MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN 10-2-17 [70] |
|-----|---|--|
- ☐ Telephone Appearance
☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied and the objection sustained.

Even though 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) prevents the proposed plan from modifying a claim secured only by the debtor's home, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) & (b)(5) permit the plan to provide for the cure of any defaults on such a claim while ongoing installment payments are maintained. The cure of defaults is not limited to the cure of pre-petition defaults. See In re Bellinger, 179 B.R. 220 (Bankr. D. Idaho 1995). The proposed plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the post-petition arrears owed to the Class 1 home lender. By failing to provide for a cure, the debtor is, in effect, impermissibly modifying a home loan. Also, the failure to cure the default means that the Class 1 secured claim will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

14. 17-26678-A-13 JOHN SHAFER
MET-1
VS. UNION LOAN SOURCE

MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL
10-24-17 [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 valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. The debtor's evidence indicates that the replacement value of the subject property is \$15,925 as of the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's evidence of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$15,925 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$15,925 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.

15. 17-26081-A-13 JESUS/NORMA QUINTERO
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
10-25-17 [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 conditionally denied.

First, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(b)(6) provides: "Documents Required by Trustee. 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

Second, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The debtor failed to state employment income from 2015 and 2017 on the statement of financial affairs as well as a financial gift from a relative. Also, the income for 2016 has been attributed to the wrong debtor. 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.

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

The objection will be sustained.

November 13, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.
– Page 11 –

17. 17-25999-A-13 RAJENDER SARIN
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
10-26-17 [20]

- ☐ 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 sustained.

First, the debtor's exemptions under Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 703.140 are subject to attack inasmuch as the nonfiling spouse did not file the waiver required by section 703.140(a)(2). Without exemptions, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4) requires that unsecured creditors approximately \$28,000 because they would receive that amount in a chapter 7 bankruptcy. The plan proposes to pay them nothing.

Second, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting motions to value the collateral of Real Time Resolutions and Harley Davidson Financial 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."

18. 17-25999-A-13 RAJENDER SARIN
RMP-1
REAL TIME RESOLUTIONS, INC. VS.

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
10-4-17 [13]

- ☐ 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 sustained in part.

Inasmuch as the debtor has failed to move to value the collateral of the objecting creditor all objections to such a motion are premature.

However, because the plan is premised on the assertion that the objecting creditor's collateral has no net value, and because the debtor has failed to file a valuation motion to corroborate that premise, the debtor cannot carry the burden of proving that the plan is feasible and provides for this secured claim in a manner consistent with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(2) and 1325(a)(5).

FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

19. 17-26721-A-13 VIENA VANDERHOOF MOTION FOR
JBC-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
ALEX DEMCHUK VS. 10-30-17 [16]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed because it is moot. The case was dismissed on October 30, 2017. As a result, the automatic stay has expired as a matter of law. See 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(1) & (c)(2). There no longer is a stay to terminate.

20. 16-22739-A-13 JOEY/SHEILA NUQUI MOTION TO
CYB-1 APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION
9-29-17 [29]

Final Ruling: This motion to modify a home loan 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 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 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 debtor is authorized but not required to enter into the proposed modification. To the extent the modification is inconsistent with the confirmed plan, the debtor shall continue to perform the plan as confirmed until it is modified.

21. 17-23942-A-13 JENNIFER FORBES MOTION TO
RAH-2 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, L.L.C. 9-29-17 [28]

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 \$352,140 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Carrington Mortgage Services. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$388,709.89 as of the petition date. Therefore, Ocwen'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 \$388,709.89. 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).

22. 17-23942-A-13 JENNIFER FORBES MOTION TO
RAH-3 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. CALHFA/KEEP YOUR HOME CALIFORNIA 9-29-17 [34]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

The motion does not comply with Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(e)(3) because when it was filed it was not accompanied by a separate proof/certificate of service. Appending a proof of service to one of the supporting documents (assuming such was done) does not satisfy the local rule. The proof/certificate of service must be a separate document so that it will be docketed on the electronic record. This permits anyone examining the docket to determine if service has been accomplished without examining every document filed in support of the matter on calendar. Given the absence of the required proof/certificate of service, the moving party has failed to establish that the motion was served on all necessary parties in interest.

23. 16-28167-A-13 MICHAEL/KAREN LEAL MOTION TO
SLH-1 MODIFY PLAN
10-6-17 [23]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(c) provides that notices in adversary proceedings and contested matters that are served on the IRS shall be mailed to three entities at three different addresses: (1) IRS, P.O. Box 7346, Philadelphia, PA 19101-7346; (2) United States Attorney, for the IRS, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814; and (3) United States Department of Justice, Civil Trial Section, Western Region, Box 683, Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Service in this case is deficient because the IRS was not served at the third address listed above.

24. 17-24185-A-13 WILLIAM ST CLAIR MOTION TO
MOH-2 SELL
9-1-17 [30]

Final Ruling: The court concludes that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. While the trustee initially objected to the sale, his objections revolved around the fact that a plan had not yet been confirmed and other issues concerning the plan's confirmability. Inasmuch as a plan has now been confirmed, it appears there are no objections to a sale. Accordingly, an actual hearing is unnecessary and this matter is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006).

The motion will be granted on the condition that the sale proceeds are used to pay all liens of record in full and in a manner consistent with the plan. Insofar as surplus sale proceeds are available, they shall be paid over to the trustee to the extent required by the confirmed plan with such additional amounts as volunteered by the debtor.

Absent either payment in full (i.e., a 100% dividend) of all filed proofs of

claim or the approval of a modified plan that permits the plan to be completed without payment in full, the plan shall not be deemed completed by payment of the sale proceeds to the trustee.

25. 17-24185-A-13 WILLIAM ST CLAIR MOTION TO
MOH-3 CONFIRM PLAN
10-2-17 [50]

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.

26. 17-26085-A-13 LAURENCE/TUACA SORRELL OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
10-25-17 [13]

Final Ruling: The trustee has voluntarily dismissed the objection.

27. 17-24391-A-13 TRE BALL MOTION TO
DBL-3 CONFIRM PLAN
10-2-17 [25]

Final Ruling: The court concludes that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. The court will not materially alter the relief requested and the issue raised by the trustee can be resolved by a nonmaterial modification to the plan. Accordingly, an actual hearing is unnecessary and this matter is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006).

The motion will be granted on the condition that the plan is further modified in the confirmation order to reduce the dividend payable each month on account of administrative expenses from \$100 to \$62. As further modified, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

28. 17-25999-A-13 RAJENDER SARIN OBJECTION TO
HARLEY-DAVIDSON CREDIT CORP. VS. CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
10-25-17 [16]

Final Ruling: The objection will be dismissed without prejudice.

An objection placed on the calendar by the objecting party for hearing must be given a unique docket control number as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(c). The purpose of the docket control number is to insure that all documents filed in support and in opposition to the objection are linked on the docket. This linkage insures that the court, as well as any party reviewing the docket, will be aware of everything filed in connection with the objection.

This objection has no docket control number. Therefore, it is possible that documents have been filed in support or in opposition to the objection that have not been brought to the attention of the court. The court will not permit the objecting creditor to profit from possible confusion caused by this breach of the court's local rules.