

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

December 7, 2015 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 8. 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 11, 2016 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 28, 2015, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JANUARY 4, 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 20 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 14, 2015, AT 2:30 P.M.

December 7, 2015 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 14-32503-A-13 RUMMY SANDHU MOTION TO
PGM-1 MODIFY PLAN
10-28-15 [66]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The debtor has failed to make any plan payments from July 2015 through November 23. According to the evidence, this default is due to health care costs for a household member. There is no evidence that these costs will not continue and interfere with the performance of a plan. In the absence of evidence that the debtor has the ability to pay these expenses as well as regular living expenses and a plan payment, the debtor has not met the burden of proving the plan's feasibility as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

2. 13-20409-A-13 SCOTT/LORI ARNOLD MOTION TO
PGM-1 VACATE DISMISSAL OF CASE
11-3-15 [45]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied.

This case was dismissed on September 3, 2015 on the trustee's motion. On or about July 28, 2015, he served a Notice of Default indicating that the debtor had failed to make plan payments totaling \$1,912. The debtors then had 30 days to pay the delinquency, or contest the notice of default, or modify their plan. The debtors did none of these things and the case was dismissed.

Despite their failure to act timely, the debtors ask the court to vacate their dismissal because their attorney failed to advise them of the notice of default or to contest it. However, this motion fails to establish that the plan was not in default and that there was no cause for dismissal.

3. 15-26116-A-13 ELLEN HATFIELD MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
10-23-15 [24]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, 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 second and third addresses listed above.

Second, because the plan fails to specify how debtor's counsel's fees will be approved, either pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 or by making a motion in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, 2017, but nonetheless requires the trustee to pay counsel a monthly dividend on account of such fees, in effect the plan requires payment of fees even though the court has not approved them. This violates sections 329 and 330.

Also, counsel is reminded that all matters placed on the calendar must be given a unique docket control number as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(c).

4. 15-27327-A-13 RONALD WHITAKER AND MELBA OBJECTION TO
JPJ-2 MCNEAL-WHITAKER EXEMPTIONS
10-29-15 [19]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The objection will be sustained.

The debtor has claimed an exemption of \$8,500 in vehicles pursuant to Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 703.140(b)(2). The maximum exemption under this statute, however, is \$5,100. Therefore, the exemption is allowed in the amount of \$5,100.

5. 15-27631-A-13 MICHAEL HAGERTY OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
11-10-15 [21]

- ☐ 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.

First, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$1,000 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, if the plan payments were current the plan would not be feasible because the monthly plan payment of \$1,000 is less than the \$1,310 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

Third, the plan is incomplete inasmuch as the plan fails to state the dividend payable to Class 7, nonpriority unsecured creditors, and the arrearage dividend payable to Class 1, the holder of a home mortgage. Without a cure of the arrears, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(2), (b)(5) and

1325(a)(5)(B). Without specifying a dividend for Class 7, the debtor cannot prove compliance with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4), (a)(6), and (b).

Fourth, on Form 22 the debtor has stated his household size at 4. However, at the meeting of creditors, he stated he was the only person in his household. The debtor's annualized current monthly income exceeds the median income for a household of 1. Despite this, he failed to complete Form 22 and estimate his projected disposable income. 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).

Fifth, 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.

Sixth, assuming the debtor meant to provide for nothing to be paid to Class 7, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

The court does not reach the objection based on the assertion that the debtor improperly claimed exemptions under Arizona law. This will require a separate objection to the exemption, which is set for hearing on December 14. Also, the fact that the debtor is now resident in California does not necessarily prevent him from claiming Arizona exemptions. See 11 U.S.C. § 522(b)(3).

6.	10-42346-A-13 RICHARD/JUDITH PERRY CA-2 VS. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.	MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL 11-23-15 [48]
----	--	--

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$260,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first

deed of trust held by CitiMortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$349,650 as of the petition date. Therefore, Wells Fargo Bank's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

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

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

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

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

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

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$260,000. 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).

7. 15-27755-A-13 ABU ALAMIN
MLF-1

MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
10-14-15 [39]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the debtor has failed to make \$4,438.64 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, 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 Wells Fargo Home Mortgage on account of its 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).

The objections concerning attorney's fees and the debtor's exemptions will be overruled. An amended Rights and Responsibilities agreement and a spousal exemption waiver have been filed.

8. 15-28294-A-13 CHARLES HOWSON
RDW-1
CAM IX TRUST VS.

MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
11-23-15 [18]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the creditor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the other creditors, the debtor, 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 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 that will surrender the subject property to the movant in satisfaction of its secured claim. That plan has not yet been confirmed. Nonetheless, the terms of the proposed plan makes two things clear: the movant's claim will not be paid and the real property securing its claim is not necessary to the debtor's personal financial reorganization. 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 10-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be waived.

THE FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

9. 13-25306-A-13 JUAN/NOEMY MENDEZ MOTION TO
PLC-3 MODIFY PLAN
11-2-15 [48]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

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

10. 11-44107-A-13 ARCHIMEDES/JAMICE MOTION TO
CYB-3 ALIMAGNO MODIFY PLAN
10-28-15 [81]

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

The motion will be granted and the objection will be overruled. The objection notes that the debtor failed to pay \$64 as required by the plan. However, after the objection was filed, the amount in default was paid. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

11. 15-27210-A-13 MARTIN/MARIA DEL CARMEN MOTION TO
PGM-1 ORTEGA VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. SANTANDER CONSUMER USA 11-3-15 [23]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$13,000 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$13,000 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is

paid \$13,000 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

12. 14-27217-A-13 MICHAEL POWELL AND MOTION TO
LBG-5 DEBORAH SENNECA APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION
10-19-15 [95]

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.

13. 15-25319-A-13 KENNETH HARPER MOTION TO
RJ-5 CONFIRM PLAN
10-5-15 [54]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed as moot. The case was dismissed on October 23, 2015.

14. 10-34924-A-13 STEVEN/LORI HANSEN MOTION TO
PGM-4 ENFORCE APPROVED LOAN MODIFICATION
11-5-15 [84]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice. The motion seeks to specifically enforce a voluntary loan modification. Such relief requires an adversary proceeding in a court with subject matter jurisdiction.

15. 15-27327-A-13 RONALD WHITAKER AND MELBA MOTION TO
PGM-1 MCNEAL-WHITAKER VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A. 11-3-15 [22]

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.

16. 15-21033-A-13 SHAMSHER/JAGJIT SANDHU
TLA-2

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Residential Credit Solutions has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The creditor filed a proof of claim that demanded nothing. The home mortgage owed by the debtor was not in default when the case was filed and the proof of claim made no demand. While the proof of claim did state the amount of the unmatured principal, that portion of the claim was not modified by the chapter 13 plan nor could it be modified by any plan the debtor might propose. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2).

Then, approximately three months after filing a proof of claim that demanded nothing from the debtor, the creditor amended its claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002.1(c) to demand \$662.48 in fees and costs incurred to prepare and file the proof of claim that demanded nothing.

The amendment to the claim will be disallowed. It is unreasonable to demand fees and costs for preparation of a claim that demands nothing particularly when the debtor agrees the creditor is owed nothing. Also, there is nothing in or appended to the proof of claim or the amendment indicating that these fees have been previously awarded by this or some other court, that these fees are properly allowable under the terms of the contract between the parties, that these fees must be paid as part of any cure of the asserted default pursuant to applicable law and the underlying agreement, that the claimant is over-secured, or that the fees are reasonable. Time records, or comparable documentation, showing the time spent on particular tasks, are not appended to the proof of claim. In the absence of such evidence, the court cannot presume this portion of the claim is a valid proof of claim. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f).

Because the claimant cannot rely on this presumption of validity, the claimant "has the burden of proving the reasonableness of its fee claim. . . ." Atwood v. Chase Manhattan Mortgage Co. (In re Atwood), 293 B.R. 227, 233 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2003). "The requirement of reasonableness requires some evidence on that question once debtors objected, pointing out the missing essential element. [Citation omitted.] As [the claimant] had the affirmative burden of showing reasonableness as a matter of law, the objection, as here, need only note the absence of any such showing, and does not require evidence of support. [Citation omitted.] In effect, the omission of the proof of claim to address an essential element of the substantive claim deprives [the claimant] of the favorable Rule 3001(f) evidentiary presumption regarding validity and amount. [Citation omitted.]" Id.

17. 13-22834-A-13 SHARON NISHIKAWA MOTION TO
JCW-1 APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION
11-6-15 [76]

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.

18. 15-27153-C-13 D JACK OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 EXEMPTIONS
10-29-15 [31]

Final Ruling: This case has been transferred to Judge Klein. Therefore, the hearing is continued to December 15, 2015 at 2:00 PM, Courtroom 33.

19. 15-22663-A-13 MELINDA LACUSKY MOTION TO
FF-3 CONFIRM PLAN
10-21-15 [37]

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.

20. 13-24775-A-13 BRENDA THOMAS
MET-2

MOTION TO
MODIFY PLAN
10-30-15 [37]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

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