

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

November 28, 2016 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 DECEMBER 27, 2016 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 12, 2016, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 19, 2016. 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 9 THROUGH 11 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 DECEMBER 5, 2016, AT 2:30 P.M.

November 28, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 15-28416-A-13 PATRICIA HANSEN MOTION TO
LBG-1 INCUR DEBT
11-3-16 [29]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion to incur a loan in order to refinance and consolidate two home loans will be granted. The motion establishes that the new loan will like enhance the ability of the debtor to complete the plan.

2. 16-26524-A-13 ANTHONY/CAMILLE BROOKS OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
11-7-16 [15]

- ☐ 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 case will be dismissed.

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, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 84 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d). This problem arises because the debtor has understated Class 7 unsecured claims by more than \$126,000. As a result, it will take 84 months, not 60 months, to pay an 11% dividend to Class 7 as promised.

3. 16-26524-A-13 ANTHONY/CAMILLE BROOKS MOTION TO
TBK-1 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. BANK OF AMERICA 11-10-16 [19]

- ☐ 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

November 28, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

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 \$630,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Bank of America. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$701,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, Bank of America'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 \$630,000. 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. 16-26325-A-13 DIANA CABELLO
JPJ-1
- OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
11-7-16 [22]
- ☐ 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's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Santander 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."

Second, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The debtor failed to

disclose on the petition a prior bankruptcy petition filed during the prior eight years. 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.

5. 16-26435-A-13 TONY/ANGELA CAMPUZANO OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
11-7-16 [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 case will be dismissed.

The joinder in the objection and motion will be stricken. The rules of joinder do not apply to contested matters. If the creditor wished to object to confirmation or move for dismissal it should have filed its own objection and/or motion.

First, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$2,555 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 177 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d). This problem arises because the plan requires payment in full of the IRS's priority claim. Because the claim is more than \$17,000 greater than assumed by the plan, the plan will exceed the maximum 5-year duration.

Third, 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).

Fourth, 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.

Fifth, the debtor has not filed federal income tax returns for 2014 and 2015. The returns are delinquent.

Prior to the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 becoming effective, the Bankruptcy Code did not require chapter 13 debtors to file delinquent tax returns. If a debtor did not file tax returns, the trustee might object to the plan on the grounds of lack of feasibility or that the plan was not proposed in good faith. See, e.g., Greatwood v. United States (In re Greatwood), 194 B.R. 637 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1996), *affirmed*, 120 F.3d. 268 (9th Cir. 1997).

Since BAPCPA became effective, a chapter 13 debtor must file most pre-petition delinquent tax returns. See 11 U.S.C. § 1308. Section 1308(a) requires a chapter 13 debtor who has failed to file tax returns under applicable nonbankruptcy law to file all such returns if they were due for tax periods during the 4-year period ending on the date of the filing of the petition. The delinquent returns must be filed by the date of the meeting of creditors.

There are two consequences to a failure to comply with section 1308. The failure is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(e). Also, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(9) and an uncodified provision of BAPCPA found at section 1228(a) of the Act provide that the court cannot confirm a plan if delinquent returns have not been filed with the taxing agency and filed with the court. This has not been done and so the court cannot confirm any plan proposed by the debtor.

Sixth, if requested by the U.S. Trustee or the chapter 13 trustee, a debtor must produce evidence of a social security number or a written statement that such documentation does not exist. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4002(b)(1)(B). In this case, the debtor has breached the foregoing duty by failing to provide evidence of the debtor's social security number. This is cause for dismissal.

Seventh, 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.

6. 16-26644-A-13 IRINA RILEY

ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE
11-9-16 [25]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will remain pending but the court will modify the terms of its order permitting the debtor to pay the filing fee in installments.

The court granted the debtor permission to pay the filing fee in installments. The debtor failed to pay the \$79 installment when due on November 4. While the delinquent installment was paid on November 10, the fact remains the court was required to issue an order to show cause to compel the payment. Therefore, as a sanction for the late payment, the court will modify its prior order allowing installment payments to provide that if a future installment is not received by its due date, the case will be dismissed without further notice or hearing.

7. 16-27460-A-13 LISA HANSEN
KS-1
SUISUN CITY/BREEZEWOOD, L.P. VS.

MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
11-14-16 [10]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied.

The movant leased residential real property to the debtor. Prior to the filing of the petition, the debtor defaulted in the payment of rent and the movant served the debtor with a three day notice to pay or quit. When the debtor did neither, an unlawful detainer action was filed and served on the debtor. The debtor answered but stipulated to vacate the premises by a date certain. The debtor failed to vacate by the deadline then filed this case.

Given the filing of the unlawful detainer and the notice to quit that necessarily preceded it, the debtor's right to possession has terminated and there is cause to terminate the automatic stay. In re Windmill Farms, Inc., 841 F.2d 1467 (9th Cir. 1988); In re Smith, 105 B.R. 50, 53 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 1989). The debtor no longer has an interest in the subject property which can be considered either property of the estate or an interest deserving of protection by section 362(a).

The stay is modified to permit the movant to seek possession of the property. No fees and costs are awarded. The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) is ordered waived.

8. 16-24178-A-13 GREGORY/KRISTY RAUZY
PGM-1

MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
10-17-16 [36]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the debtor has filed inconsistent schedules and statements. They state both that the debtor has a household of two and three. Absent an explanation

November 28, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

- Page 7 -

for the change, the court will not permit expenses based on a household of three.

Second, the debtor has not proven that the plan satisfies 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b) either by paying unsecured creditors in full or paying them all projected disposable income over the next five years. As proposed the plan will pay Class 7 unsecured creditors \$47,086. If allowed expense deductions are reduced to a household of two, if the debtor's income is increased to match the debtor's current monthly income reflected in his pay advices, if the codebtor's income is increased to match the debtor's current monthly income reflected in her pay advices, the debtor's projected disposable income increases to \$135,144 over five years. Because this will not be paid to unsecured creditors, the plan cannot be confirmed over the trustee's objection.

Third, the debtor proposes to retain the collateral of Sacramento Credit Union but fails to provide for its secured claim in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(B).

9. 16-26589-A-13 KAREN LAVOW
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
11-7-16 [26]

- ☐ 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 case will be dismissed.

First, the debtor has not filed a federal income tax return for 2013. The return is delinquent.

Prior to the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 becoming effective, the Bankruptcy Code did not require chapter 13 debtors to file delinquent tax returns. If a debtor did not file tax returns, the trustee might object to the plan on the grounds of lack of feasibility or that the plan was not proposed in good faith. See, e.g., Greatwood v. United States (In re Greatwood), 194 B.R. 637 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1996), *affirmed*, 120 F.3d. 268 (9th Cir. 1997).

Since BAPCPA became effective, a chapter 13 debtor must file most pre-petition delinquent tax returns. See 11 U.S.C. § 1308. Section 1308(a) requires a chapter 13 debtor who has failed to file tax returns under applicable nonbankruptcy law to file all such returns if they were due for tax periods during the 4-year period ending on the date of the filing of the petition. The delinquent returns must be filed by the date of the meeting of creditors.

In this case, the meeting of creditors was held and concluded. While it is possible for the deadline to file the delinquent returns to be extended, to

receive an extension the trustee hold the meeting of creditors open. See 11 U.S.C. § 1308(b). The trustee did not hold the meeting open. Hence, the deadline for filing the delinquent returns has expired and it is impossible for the debtor to comply with section 1308.

There are two consequences to a failure to comply with section 1308. The failure is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(e). Also, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(9) and an uncodified provision of BAPCPA found at section 1228(a) of the Act provide that the court cannot confirm a plan if delinquent returns have not been filed with the taxing agency and filed with the court. This has not been done and so the court cannot confirm any plan proposed by the debtor.

Second, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 155 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d). This problem arises because the plan requires payment in full of the IRS's priority claim. Because the claim is more than \$10,000 greater than assumed by the plan, the plan will exceed the maximum 5-year duration.

Third, the debtor proposes to retain the debtor's home but fails to provide for payment in full of the homeowner's association's lien on it. Thus, the plan either is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), or it will not pay a secured claim in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

10. 16-27006-A-13 LISA HANSEN MOTION FOR
KS-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
SUISUN CITY/BREEZEWOOD, L.P. VS. 10-24-16 [8]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed as moot. Because the case was dismissed on November 8, the automatic stay has expired as a matter of law. See 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(1) & (c)(2).

11. 16-26435-A-13 TONY/ANGELA CAMPUZANO MOTION FOR
WT-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
BRIKEMEN, L.L.C. VS. 10-28-16 [15]

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 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to permit the movant to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and to obtain possession of the subject real property following sale. The movant is secured by a deed of trust encumbering the debtor's real property. The debtor has proposed a plan but it is not yet been confirmed. That plan does not identify the movant's claim and hence it does not provide for its payment. Even if it did, the debtor failed to commence plan payments. As a result, at least one post petition installment has not been paid to the movant. Finally, the debtor has come forward with no evidence that the subject real property is necessary to the debtor's personal financial reorganization or that such reorganization is in prospect. This is cause to terminate the automatic stay.

Because the movant has not established that the value of its collateral exceeds the amount of its claim, the court awards no fees and costs. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be waived.