Best interests of creditors test § 1325(a)(4) Exemptions

Unpublished

In re Vijay and Joycelyn Nakka
Case No. 693-60770-fra13

6/19/96 FRA

Debtors modified their Chapter 13 plan, rejecting a contract with an automobile finance company and increasing their plan payments. The trustee objected to the modified plan on the ground that it failed to meet the best interests of creditors test found at \$ 1325(a)(4) which requires that creditors receive at least as much under the Chapter 13 plan as they would in a hypothetical liquidation under Chapter 7. The objection was premised on the assumption that debtors' homestead exemption is limited to \$20,000, the amount of the homestead exemption in 1993 on the petition date, rather than to \$33,000, the amount of the homestead exemption at the date of the modified plan.

When a plan is modified, the hypothetical liquidation of § 1325(a)(4) would occur at the date of the modified plan. § 522(b)(2) exempts from property of the estate any property that is exempt under state law that is applicable at the petition date. Under Oregon law, the value of the exemption is determined at the time of the sale as opposed to the time the judgment lien or levy attached. Since the estate takes property subject to this state law doctrine, a hypothetical Chapter 7 trustee would be bound by the exemption amount in effect at the time he sold the homestead property and not the amount at the petition date. In this case, the exemption amount to be used is \$33,000. Using this amount, the best interests test was met.

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

## FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

In Re:

) Bankruptcy Case No.
) 693-60770-fra13

VIJAY R. NAKKA and
) OYCELYN R. NAKKA,
) MEMORANDUM OPINION
Debtors.

## INTRODUCTION

Debtors have proposed to modify their Chapter 13 plan of reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 1329. The original plan, dated February 25, 1993, was confirmed on April 26, 1993, and modified once previously on October 11, 1993. The current modification rejects a contract with an automobile finance company which had received payments under the original plan, and increases monthly plan payments from \$330 to \$375.

The Trustee objects to the modified plan because it fails to satisfy the best interest of creditors test. The trustee's calculation is based on an assumption that Debtors' exemption in their residence is limited to \$20,000, the amount of the Oregon homestead exemption in 1993. See *former* ORS 23.240. In 1993 the

Oregon Legislature increased the combined exemption for "two or more members of the household who are debtors" to \$33,000. The increase became effective on November 4, 1993. Debtors claim that the best interest test calculation should use this figure, and that, using the higher exemption, their modified plan passes the test.<sup>1</sup>

Section 1325(a)(4) requires that unsecured creditors receive at least as much under the plan as they would under a hypothetical chapter 7 liquidation. The issue here is how the hypothetical liquidation is constructed. In other words, where the figures used are variable due to market and legislative shifts, to what point in time does the analyst look to calculate the effect of a liquidation?

## DISCUSSION

The starting point is 11 U.S.C. §1329:

§ 1329. Modification of plan after confirmation.

- (a) At any time after confirmation of the plan but before the completion of payments under such plan, the plan may be modified, upon request of the debtor, the trustee, or the holder of an allowed unsecured claim, to-
- (1) increase or reduce the amount of payments on claims of a particular class provided for by the plan;
  - (2) extend or reduce the time for such payments; or
- (3) alter the amount of the distribution to a creditor whose claim is provided for by the plan to the extent necessary to take account of any payment of such claim other than under the plan.
  - (b) (1) Sections 1322(a), 1322(b), and 1323(c) of this title and the requirements of section 1325(a) of this title apply to any modification under subsection(a) of this section.

\* \* \*

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Trustee also objected because the proposed plan is under funded by \$171. Debtors concede this point, and now propose to increase the plan payments to \$395 per month.

Section 1325(a) includes the so-called best interests of creditors test:

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the court shall confirm a plan if—

\* \* \*

(4) the value, as of the effective date of the plan, of property to be distributed under the plan on account of each allowed unsecured claim is not less than the amount that would be paid on such claim if the estate of the debtor were liquidated under chapter 7 of this title on such date; (italics added)

The phrase "effective date of the plan", in this context, must be construed as meaning the date of the modified plan. The legislative history states as much:

In applying the standards of proposed 11 USC 1325(a)(4) to the confirmation of a modified plan, "the plan" as used in this section will be the plan as modified under this section...This, the application of the liquidation value test must be redetermined at the time of the confirmation of the modified plan. H.R. Report No 595, 95th Cong. 1st Sess., 431 (1977)

This rule has been followed in this District. <u>In re Walker</u>, 153 BR 565, 568 (Bankr. D.Or. 1993).

The trustee argues that, notwithstanding the fictional "date" of the liquidation, the value to be given to the homestead exemption is fixed as of the date of the petition for relief, by operation of Code § 522(b)(2), which exempts from property of the estate:

(2) (A) any property that is exempt under Federal law, other than subsection (d) of this section, or State or local law that is applicable on the date of the filing of the petition at the place in which the debtor's domicile has been located for the 180 days immediately preceding the date of filing of the petition, or for a longer portion of such 180-day period than in any other place....

The statute does not by itself establish the nature or value

MEMORANDUM OPINION-4

1 2

\_

T (

of any exemption: it simply provides that the exemption is to be determined according to state law.<sup>2</sup>

Oregon law exempts from seizure by or for creditors the debtor's homestead. The value of the exemption is determined at the time of the sale, as opposed to the time the judgement lien or levy attached. ORS 23.240 ("A homestead shall be exempt from sale on execution..."); ORS 23.445 (Court authorization required for sale of residence). If the value of the exemption is increased by the legislature after a judgement lien attaches, but before sale on execution, the debtor is nevertheless entitled to benefit from the increased exemption. Wilkinson v. Carpenter, 277 Or. 557, 561 P.2d 607 (1977). Since the estate takes property subject to this state law doctrine, a (hypothetical) Chapter 7 trustee is bound by the exemption amount in effect at the time he sells the homestead property. This would be the time of the modified plan, and not the time the petition was filed.

It follows that the hypothetical liquidation must be premised on a \$33,000 homestead exemption. Given that, there appears to be no equity available for unsecured creditors, and therefore the best interest of creditors test is satisfied by the proposed modified plan. An order overruling the objection shall be entered.

FRANK R. ALLEY, III Bankruptcy Judge

 $<sup>^2</sup> Pursuant$  to Code § 522(b), Oregon has excluded use of Federal exemptions. ORS 23.305.