United States Bankruptcy Court District of New Mexico

Document Verification

Case Title:	Gar	v T. Sperling a	and Diane C. Sp	erling		
Case Number:		02-18870				
Chapter :		7				
Judge Code:		SL				
e	Location: Las	Las Cruces				
Reference Nu	mber: 7 - 0	7 - 02-18870 - SL				
Document Information						
Number:	28					
Description:	Memorandum Opinion on Abandonment of Assets re: [22-1] Motion For Order Determining Assets of Case to be Fully Administered. by Gary T. Sperling, Diane C. Sperling .					
Size:	4 pages (14k)					
Date Received:	02/05/2004 02:05:38 PM	Date Filed:	02/05/2004	Date Entered On Dock	xet: 02/05/2004	
	Court Digital Signature		,	View History		
aa 76 87 5f 17 e7 0d 75 3b fc 6c 9e d1 33 5b 1f f3 f0 c3 86 3f 79 1d 30 12 7b 31 59 41 01 07 94 37 69 c5 d0 a9 98 5d 72 bb 98 b8 7c 36 a0 b6 03 f5 3d c5 b7 94 90 6a 32 37 14 2a 5d 18 8c 88 3a c8 71 ea ec 7e ce 4d a1 02 64 e1 ba cf c3 be 94 39 fa 3b 4b 71 6c e4 11 0e af a0 3b d1 1b 69 7f 76 c7 18 22 7c df f4 1a d5 80 b0 14 df 19 c7 f2 73 8d 9a f3 f2 3e fa 6a cd 9b 5c f5 b1 1d 4b 39						
Filer Information						
Submitted By:	James E Burke	,				
Comments:	Memorandum	Memorandum Opinion on Abandonment of Assets				

Digital Signature: The Court's digital signature is a verifiable mathematical computation unique to this document and the Court's private encryption key. This signature assures that any change to the document can be detected.

Verification: This form is verification of the status of the document identified above as of *Wednesday*, *December 22*, 2004. If this form is attached to the document identified above, it serves as an endorsed copy of the document.

Note: Any date shown above is current as of the date of this verification. Users are urged to review the official court docket for a specific event to confirm information, such as entered on docket date for purposes of appeal. Any element of information on this form, except for the digital signature and the received date, is subject to change as changes may be entered on the Court's official docket.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

In re: GARY SPERLING and DIANNE SPERLING, Debtors.

NO. 7-02-18870 SL

MEMORANDUM OPINION ON ABANDONMENT OF ASSETS

This matter is before the Court on the Debtors' Motion for Order Determining Assets of Case to be Fully Administered and the Trustee's objection thereto. Debtors are represented by R. Trey Arvizu, III. The Trustee Oralia Franco is selfrepresented. This is a core proceeding. 28 U.S.C. § 157(b). For the reasons set forth below, the Court finds that Debtors' Motion should be denied.

The facts are not disputed. Debtors filed their chapter 7 case on December 17, 2002 and Oralia Franco was appointed trustee. The first meeting of creditors was scheduled for January 21, 2003. The Trustee adjourned the meeting to the February docket to allow Debtors to file an amendment correcting social security numbers. The Trustee filed an objection to the Debtor's exemptions on February 13, 2003. The Trustee conducted the continued creditors' meeting on February 25, 2003 and filed her report of the meeting on March 5, 2003 which 1) stated that the creditors' meeting was concluded, and 2) checked a box on the preprinted meeting report form that stated:

I report that I have neither received any property nor paid any money on account of this estate except exempt property, and that I have made a diligent inquiry into the financial affairs of the debtor(s) and the location of the property belonging to the estate, and that there is no property available for distribution from the estate over and above that exempted by law. Pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 5009, I certify that this estate has been fully administered. I request that this report be approved and that I be discharged from any further duties as trustee.

Debtors were discharged on March 31, 2003 and on April 4, 2003 the final decree was issued and the case was closed¹. The Trustee filed a Motion to Reopen Case to Administer Assets of the Estate on April 8, 2003, and an Amended Motion to Reopen Case to Administer Assets of the Estate on April 9, 2003. Attached to the Amended Motion is an affidavit by the Trustee's paralegal that states the "no-asset" box on the report was checked in error. Also attached to the Amended Motion is a letter from Debtors' attorney to the Trustee offering to settle the objection to exemptions through a cash payment to the Trustee.

DISCUSSION

¹ The closing of the case with a pending objection to exemptions may have been an administrative error. However, the Court does not need to decide this to rule.

As a general rule, once an asset of the estate has been abandoned by the trustee it is no longer part of the estate and is effectively beyond the reach and control of the Trustee. <u>In re Hill</u>, 195 B.R. 147, 151 (Bankr. D. N.M. 1996)(<u>citing In re Sutton</u>, 10 B.R. 737 (Bankr. E.D. Va. 1981)). Courts recognize several exceptions to the general rule, one of which is "where the trustee's abandonment was the result of a mistake or inadvertence, and no undue prejudice will result in revocation of the abandonment." <u>In re Ozer</u>, 208 B.R. 630, 634 (Bankr. E.D. N.Y. 1997). <u>See also Woods v.</u> <u>Kenan (In re Woods)</u>, 173 F.3d 770, 780 (10th Cir.

1999)(Abandonments can be revoked under Rule 60(b) but that relief can be challenged on equitable grounds such as unfair prejudice to the property owner.); <u>Rameker v. Berning Garage</u>, <u>Inc. (In re Alt)</u>, 39 B.R. 902, 904 (Bankr. W.D. Wisc. 1984)(Court can set aside abandonment if the abandonment was an "inadvertent error" and the parties will not be unduly prejudiced.) <u>Cf. Hill</u>, 195 B.R. at 149 ("The operation of § 554(c) is grounded upon a presumption of intentional abandonment by the trustee.") The fact that the error occurred in part because the § 341 meeting was rescheduled to permit the Debtors to file the amendment to correct the social security numbers takes this case out of the "mere

Page -3-

carelessness" category and, in light of the confusion following the second § 341 meeting, puts it into the "excusable neglect" category. <u>In re Woods</u>, 173 F.3d at 779.

In this case, the Court finds that the no-asset report was the result of mistake, inadvertence or excusable neglect by the Trustee. The Court further finds that setting aside the no-asset report will not unduly prejudice the Debtors. The result is that the Debtors will be placed in the situation they would normally be in had the error not occurred. For these reasons, the Court will deny Debtors' Motion.

Mas Jason ----

Honorable James S. Starzynski United States Bankruptcy Judge

I hereby certify that on February 5, 2004, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was either electronically transmitted, faxed, delivered, or mailed to the listed counsel and parties.

R Trey Arvizu, III PO Box 3132 Roswell, NM 88202-3132

Oralia B. Franco 2000 E Lohman Ste B Las Cruces, NM 88001-3100

James S. Buske___