

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

December 4, 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 10. 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 JANUARY 2, 2018 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 18, 2017, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 26, 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 11 THROUGH 19 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 11, 2017, AT 2:30 P.M.

December 4, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 17-26701-A-13 ROSE RODRIGUEZ ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE
11-14-17 [25]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will be dismissed.

The debtor was given permission to pay the filing fee in installments pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1006(b). The installment in the amount of \$79 due on November 9 was not paid. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c) (2).

2. 17-20405-A-13 EFREN/ELIZABETH MOTION TO
DBJ-7 MEMORACION AVOID JUDICIAL LIEN
VS. INVESTMENT RETRIEVERS, INC. 11-1-17 [162]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied.

First, the motion asserts that the debtor has exempted \$13,002,000 of equity in three properties. If every exemption available under California law were cumulated, they would not add up to \$13,002,000.

Second, the debtor amended Schedule C on November 1, 2017, to claim the exemptions referenced in the motion, but the debtor did not serve the Amended Schedule C on any of the creditors and the trustee. Parties in interest have 30 days from an exemption amendment to object to any added or altered exemptions. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4003(b)(1). The debtor has not afforded parties in interest such an opportunity.

Third, even if the amended Schedule C was served, even if no objection was raised, and even if the exemption amounts are as stated in the amended schedule and not this motion, there is no evidence with this motion establishing that the debtor was entitled to the exemptions. It is not enough that the debtor claimed the exemption and it has been allowed because no one objected. If the debtor wishes to avoid a judicial lien, the debtor must establish that the debtor is actually entitled to the exemption. Accord Morgan v. Fed. Deposit Ins. Corp. (In re Morgan), 149 B.R. 147, 152 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1993) (citing In re Mohring, 142 B.R. 389, 392 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1992)). The supporting declaration by the debtor's attorney makes no effort to establish the factual requirements for an exemption of the property and it is doubtful he has the requisite personal knowledge to do so.

3. 17-26011-A-13 MICHEL FALZON ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE
11-15-17 [16]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will remain pending but the court will modify the

December 4, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.

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 \$77 installment when due on November 13. While the delinquent installment was paid on November 16, 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.

4. 17-23129-A-13 TIMOTHY NEHER MOTION TO
TLN-17 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. LENDINGHOME/LENDINGHOME FUNDING CORP. 10-11-17 [125]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied. While the motion references exhibits supporting the debtor's valuation, no such exhibits are included with this motion or the debtor's original valuation motion. Also, there is no declaration from the debtor attesting to any of the facts alleged in the motion.

5. 17-23732-A-13 GREGORY/CHRISTINE ALLEN MOTION TO
LBG-2 SELL
11-13-17 [73]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The motion will be granted.

The motion to sell real property is granted on the condition that the sale proceeds are used to pay all liens of record (including any lien that has been stripped off or stripped down in this case) in full (unless the lien holder agrees otherwise) 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.

6. 17-26645-A-13 ERIC/ADINA HENDERSON
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
11-15-17 [18]

- ☐ 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.

The debtor has not failed to file an income tax return for 2016. 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.

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). In this case, however, the trustee has not moved for dismissal. 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.

7. 17-26446-A-13 ANDREA MOX
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
11-15-17 [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.

First, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Wells Fargo 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."

Second, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of \$250 is less than the \$277.78 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.

8.	17-26446-A-13 ANDREA MOX APN-1 WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. VS.	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN 11-13-17 [24]
----	--	---

- ☐ 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 for the reasons stated in the ruling on the trustee's objection (JPJ-1).

9.	17-26446-A-13 ANDREA MOX NF-1 VS. WELLS FARGO BANK NV, N.A.	MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL 10-18-17 [13]
----	--	--

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied.

According to Schedule A, the debtor owns real property Chico. Schedule A indicates that she is the sole owner of it. This property is her home. The motion to value the home does not contradict these facts.

However, the opposition includes copies of the loan documents which form the basis of the respondent's claim. The loan originated in January 2006. Those documents indicate that title to the home is vested in the debtor and the nondebtor. This documentation does not indicate whether they hold title as joint tenants or as tenants in common.

The valuation motion includes nothing about the title of the property or any transfer between the two owners.

Therefore, by this motion the debtor seeks to value real property which is co-owned with a third party who is not a debtor in this case and who is not the debtor's spouse. The debtor contends that because the subject property has a value less than is owed on a senior encumbrance held by Select Portfolio Servicing, the court should value the respondent's interest in the property at \$0 and permit her to strip off the respondent's encumbrance at the conclusion of the case.

The respondent objects, pointing out that the debtor's discharge may only benefit her (11 U.S.C. § 524(a)), and application of 11 U.S.C. § 506(a)(1) & (d) is limited to the property of the estate. Because the co-owner's undivided interest in the property is not property of the estate, the respondent's lien still encumbers it and its entire claim may be enforced against the property even if the debtor completes this case and receives a discharge. See Rodriguez v. Madera County Federal Credit Union (In re Rodriguez), 156 B.R. 659 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1993).

The result would be otherwise if the co-owner were the debtor's spouse. When a debtor's spouse does not join in the bankruptcy case, in California their community property becomes property of the estate even though only one spouse files a bankruptcy petition. See 11 U.S.C. § 541(a)(2); Highland Federal Bank v. Maynard (In re Maynard), 264 B.R. 209 (BAP 9th Cir. 2001).

10. 17-23793-A-13 RANJIT SINGH MOTION TO
JPJ-2 CONVERT OR TO DISMISS CASE
10-31-17 [44]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be granted and the case converted to one under chapter 7.

This case was filed on June 5, 2017. The debtor proposed a plan within the time required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3015(b) but was unable to confirm it. The debtor thereafter failed to promptly propose a modified plan and set it for a confirmation hearing. This fact suggests to the court that the debtor either does not intend to confirm a plan or does not have the ability to do so. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1) & (c)(5).

Also, the debtor has failed to pay to the trustee approximately \$1,563 as required by the last proposed plan. The inability of the debtor to confirm and a plan and make plan payments is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that no plan will be feasible. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. §

1307(c) (1) .

After a review of the schedules, the court concludes that conversion rather than dismissal is in the best interests of creditors because there is in excess of \$63,000 of equity in unencumbered, nonexempt assets that will benefit creditors if liquidated by a trustee.

FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

11. 17-20901-A-13 MARK RINGOR MOTION TO
JPJ-2 CONVERT OR TO DISMISS CASE
10-31-17 [29]

Final Ruling: The court concludes that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. There is no objection to the relief requested and the court will not materially alter the relief requested. 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 and the case converted to one under chapter 7.

The debtor has failed to pay to the trustee approximately \$5,660 as required by the plan. The foregoing has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause for dismissal or conversion of the case to one under chapter 7, whichever is in the best interests of creditors. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

After a review of the schedules, the court concludes that conversion rather than dismissal is in the best interests of creditors because there is in excess of \$32,000 of equity in unencumbered, nonexempt assets that will benefit creditors if liquidated by a trustee.

12. 16-26714-A-13 PAULA HUTCHINSON MOTION TO
PGM-3 MODIFY PLAN
10-27-17 [84]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the debtor, 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 trustee, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

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

13. 13-21020-A-13 LYUDMILA/SAMVEL MOTION TO
PGM-10 TATINTSYAN APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTORS'
ATTORNEY
11-6-17 [110]

Final Ruling: The motion has been voluntarily dismissed.

14. 16-24135-A-13 JAMES OLIVER MOTION TO
PGM-4 MODIFY PLAN
10-26-17 [89]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after

December 4, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.

confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the debtor, 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 trustee, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

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

15. 15-22548-A-13 MARGARET CLARK MOTION TO
BLG-7 MODIFY PLAN
10-27-17 [133]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the debtor, 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 trustee, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

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

16. 16-24670-A-13 JORGE/LAURA ORELLANA MOTION TO
MET-3 MODIFY PLAN
10-24-17 [38]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the debtor, 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 trustee, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

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

17. 17-25179-A-13 QUINTON/ISARAPORN JACKSON MOTION TO
PGM-1 CONFIRM PLAN
10-17-17 [25]

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.

18.	17-24490-A-13	RAYMOND/ELIZABETH	MOTION FOR
	UST-1	CAMPBELL	REVIEW OF FEES
			10-25-17 [47]

Final Ruling: Given that the debtor has filed a motion to confirm a plan that will be heard on January 22, 2018 at 1:30 p.m., and given that the debtor recently amended Schedule B and filed a second amended Form 122C, the court continues this hearing to January 22, 2018 at 1:30 p.m. If the U.S. Trustee wishes to file a reply, it shall be filed and served no later than January 8, 2018.

19.	17-21994-A-13	IMOGENE ESPINOZA	MOTION TO
	PLC-3		CONFIRM PLAN
			10-20-17 [49]

Final Ruling: Because the case has been dismissed, the motion is moot. However, a hearing has been set on December 11 at 1:30 p.m. to consider vacating the dismissal. This hearing is continued to December 11, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.