

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus  
Bankruptcy Judge  
Sacramento, California

December 18, 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 3. 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 16, 2018 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JANUARY 2, 2018, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JANUARY 9, 2018. 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 4 THROUGH 12 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 26, 2017, AT 2:30 P.M.

December 18, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.

**Matters to be Called for Argument**

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | 14-25050-A-13    STEPHEN PATTON<br>AP-1<br>WELLS FARGO BANK., N.A. VS.                               | MOTION FOR<br>RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY<br>11-17-17 [58] |
|    | <input type="checkbox"/> Telephone Appearance<br><input type="checkbox"/> Trustee Agrees with Ruling |   |

**Tentative Ruling:**    The motion will be dismissed as moot.

The court confirmed a plan on September 26, 2014. That plan provides for the movant's claim in Class 4. Class 4 secured claims are long-term claims that are not modified by the plan and that were not in default prior to the filing of the petition. They are paid directly by the debtor or by a third party. The plan includes the following provision at section 2.11:

"Class 4 claims mature after the completion of this plan, are not in default, and are not modified by this plan. These claims shall be paid by Debtor or a third person whether or not the plan is confirmed. Upon confirmation of the plan, all bankruptcy stays are modified to allow the holder of a Class 4 secured claim to exercise its rights against its collateral and any nondebtor in the event of a default under applicable law or contract."

Because the plan has been confirmed and because the case remains pending under chapter 13, the automatic stay has already been modified to permit the movant to proceed against its collateral.

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 2. | 17-27878-A-13    KASSIE WESTERVELT<br>SDH-1  | MOTION TO<br>EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY<br>12-4-17 [8] |
|    | <input type="checkbox"/> Telephone Appearance<br><input type="checkbox"/> 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.

This is the second chapter 13 case filed by the debtor. A prior chapter 13 case was dismissed within one year of the most recent petition.

11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(A) provides that if a single or joint case is filed by or against a debtor who is an individual in a case under chapter 7, 11, or 13, and if a single or joint case of the debtor was pending within the preceding one-year period but was dismissed, the automatic stay with respect to a debt, property securing such debt, or any lease terminates on the 30<sup>th</sup> day after the

filing of the new case.

Section 362(c)(3)(B) allows a debtor to file a motion requesting the continuation of the stay. A review of the docket reveals that the debtor has filed this motion to extend the automatic stay before the 30<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of the petition. The motion will be adjudicated before the 30-day period expires.

In order to extend the automatic stay, the party seeking the relief must demonstrate that the filing of the new case was in good faith as to the creditors to be stayed. For example, in In re Whitaker, 341 B.R. 336, 345 (Bankr. S.D. Ga. 2006), the court held: "[T]he chief means of rebutting the presumption of bad faith requires the movant to establish 'a substantial change in the financial or personal affairs of the debtor . . . or any other reason to conclude' that the instant case will be successful. If the instant case is one under chapter 7, a discharge must now be permissible. If it is a case under chapters 11 or 13, there must be some substantial change."

Here, it appears that the debtor was unable to maintain her plan payments in the first case due to an addiction and medical issues that required her to leave work without pay. Both issues have been treated and the debtor is able to maintain her plan payments. This is a sufficient change in circumstances rebut the presumption of bad faith.

3. 17-26896-A-13 AARON MCCONVILLE ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE  
11-30-17 [20]

- ☐ 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 20 was not paid. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(2).

**FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE**

4. 17-27307-A-13 KIMBERLY WELCH MOTION TO  
RWH-2 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. NISSAN MOTOR ACCEPTANCE 11-8-17 [13]

**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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 debtor is the owner of the subject property. The debtor's evidence indicates that the replacement value of the subject property is \$10,430 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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$10,430 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$10,430 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.

5. 17-27307-A-13 KIMBERLY WELCH MOTION TO  
RWH-3 AVOID JUDICIAL LIEN  
VS. CAPITAL ONE BANK (USA) N.A. 11-16-17 [23]

**Final Ruling:** Because this motion was set for hearing before the deadline to object to the debtor's exemptions has expired (January 6, 2018), and because this motion may be granted only if the judicial lien impairs an exemption to which the debtor is entitled, the court continues the hearing to January 8 at 1:30 PM. A further continuance may be required if an objection to the debtor's exemption is filed timely. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4003(b).

6. 14-26615-A-13 HAKEEM/IRMA MUHAMMAD MOTION TO  
SAC-2 AVOID JUDICIAL LIEN  
VS. MARVIN TOM 9-19-17 [44]

**Final Ruling:** The motion was voluntarily dismissed on December 10.

7. 14-26615-A-13 HAKEEM/IRMA MUHAMMAD MOTION TO  
SAC-3 AVOID JUDICIAL LIEN  
VS. MARVIN TOM 9-19-17 [49]

**Final Ruling:** The motion was voluntarily dismissed on December 10.

8. 17-25116-A-13 WILLIAM KERSEY  
CA-3

MOTION TO  
CONFIRM PLAN  
11-6-17 [44]

**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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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.

9. 17-26434-A-13 TRINA ENOS  
PLG-2  
VS. CAPITAL ONE AUTO FINANCE

MOTION TO  
VALUE COLLATERAL  
11-20-17 [31]

**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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 debtor is the owner of the subject property. The debtor's evidence indicates that the replacement value of the subject property is \$7,055 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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$7,055 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$7,055 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.

10. 17-26052-A-13 TANISHA MAVY  
TM-3  
VS. UNIVERSAL ACCEPTANCE CORP.

MOTION TO  
VALUE COLLATERAL  
11-13-17 [52]

**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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 debtor is the owner of the subject property. The debtor's evidence indicates that the replacement value of the subject property is \$745.90 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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$745.90 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$745.90 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.

11. 15-26890-A-13 EDUARDO MORALES ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE  
11-17-17 [58]

**Final Ruling:** The order to show cause will be discharged. The creditor failed to pay the filing fee for a motion to restrict access to a document. However, after the order to show cause was issued the fee was paid. No prejudice resulted from the late payment.

12. 17-26693-A-13 MARGO JACKSON MOTION TO  
PGM-1 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. MECHANICS BANK 11-20-17 [14]

**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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 debtor is the owner of the subject property. The debtor's evidence indicates that the replacement value of the subject property is \$6,000 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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$6,000 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$6,000 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.