

**United States Bankruptcy Court
District of New Mexico**

Document Verification

Case Title: **Randall S. Ferguson and Donna Renee Ferguson**
Case Number: **04-11927**
Chapter : **13**
Judge Code: **SR**
First Meeting Location: **Roswell**
Reference Number: **13 - 04-11927 - SR**

Document Information		
Number:	23	
Description:	Minutes of Hearing Held On 10/5/04 Re: [2-1] Chapter 13 Plan. Confirmation denied. Debtors have 30 days to file amended plan, convert, or dismiss. If Debtors fail to do any of these, Trustee to submit order dismissing.	
Size:	3 pages (8k)	
Date Received:	10/06/2004 01:23:25 PM	Date Filed: 10/06/2004 Date Entered On Docket: 10/06/2004
Court Digital Signature		View History
2c 97 61 b8 2d 4a 99 0f f8 8f c9 9f e7 fc 21 33 50 28 51 03 bb 70 e9 68 74 31 ed ba b2 74 70 a7 97 d8 2e b8 fd b1 ab df 44 b8 f2 e7 f6 32 c2 6f 49 e9 b6 7f 33 cb 28 3a 58 ef 94 f9 70 e7 59 21 1d 7b 3a 4d 18 7d 03 8b fc d2 9a 6a a4 67 ff c5 74 5c c4 ff b9 cc 22 7c 53 5d 93 7f 1e 13 eb 96 74 f3 97 a3 d2 31 09 cb 69 cf 9c 19 36 76 c1 00 16 8f 45 7e 77 27 ac 72 5e 55 e5 c6 7e 50 2f 89		
Filer Information		
Submitted By:	James E Burke	
Comments:	Minutes of Hearing Held on October 5, 2004	

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
DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

Clerk's Minutes

Before the Honorable James Starzynski

James Burke, Law Clerk
Jill Peterson, Courtroom Deputy

****Hearing was Digitally Recorded**

Date:

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2004

In Re: Ferguson

No. 13-04-11927 SR

Oral ruling on confirmation of Chapter 13 Plan

Trey Arvizu - Debtors

Annette DeBois - Trustee

TIME STARTED: 4:15 TIME ENDED: 4:35

Summary of Proceedings:

Exhibits _____

Testimony _____

Confirmation denied.

Debtors have 30 days to file amended plan, convert, or dismiss.

If Debtors fail to do any of these, Trustee to submit order dismissing.

NOTE: Court's notes for oral ruling attached.

Oral Ruling
October 5, 2004

1334; 157; 7052. Reviewed schedules and other parts of the file, plan, testimony, exhibits and arguments of counsel. The plan will not be confirmed, but the Debtors can have thirty days from today to file an amended plan or to convert or dismiss their case, failing which the Trustee should submit an order to the Court dismissing the case.

I have assumed for purpose of this ruling that the extra \$120/month for several months that Mr. Arvizu mentioned in his OS can and will be made up, can and will be made up.

Parties (Debtor, creditors, trustee) and Court need to take the Debtors' situation as they find it. In this case, that refers in part to the Debtors' argument that they live in an inexpensive house and chose to do that so that they could put more money into their retirement account, and in part to similar arguments made by the Debtors concerning their other proposed expenses. Congress has not specified some ultimate amount that every debtor can work up against, and at least in this district neither have the courts. (Candidly, what happens is that people with more income end up with budgets that allow them to spend more money than those debtors who have less income.) In consequence, each case gets decided on a case-by-case basis, with the standard being the "totality of the circumstances", a test which Justice Scalia has characterized as providing no standard at all but a test which allows the courts to render decisions based on the general outlines provided by the Code and then, over time, to compare the results and see what patterns emerge - which is probably not the worst way to ultimately construct standards by which to make decisions.

So maybe the Debtors get credit for one vehicle and a low house payment and maybe not. The low house payment makes sense for the Debtors anyway because soon they will want to be in a small house (assuming the kids leave, at least eventually. And the Debtors got the benefit of the higher retirement fund payments for some years before they had to file. And just because some people have a higher house payment, or have higher car payments, does not mean that these higher payments are reasonably necessary for the support of the debtor or a dependent of the debtor, § 1325(b)(2), which after all is the standard, not matching or keeping up with the Joneses.

The cost of the Suburban is too high in these circumstances; with the daughter old enough to drive the old pickup and no need for the Debtors to haul around loads of kids for activities, and Mr. Ferguson having a company car, the creditors do not need to support a \$35m vehicle.

To give up the 6% match on the retirement funds would be a real waste, but that only benefits the Debtors, not the creditors. So the next plan (if there is one) needs to make this benefit work for the creditors; it needs to increase the payments or extend the payments in order to provide the creditors with the difference between what they would get if the Debtors continued contributing to and repaying the retirement fund and what the creditors would get if the Debtors stopped making the contributions and repayments to the retirement fund and suffered the consequences of the higher taxes, including the withdrawal penalty; in other words, the increase in the overall plan

payments would not be the gross amount of \$607 but a lesser amount taking into account that the Debtors' disposable income would be lower because they would have to pay a withdrawal penalty and treat the unrepaid loan as income and therefore have to pay higher taxes.

In general, the \$200/month for recreation, taking into consideration all the other expenses that are listed (dance lessons, cable, higher hygiene costs, etc.), is too high.

Concerning the big screen television and dining set, given the small amount of the debt and the fact that it is for both the dining room set and the tv, and what you get in a yard sale for a big screen tv and a dining room set may not be very much, and the fact that the dining room set would have to be replaced anyway, this is in effect de minimis.

In this case, there are certainly some expenses which seem high but are justified; e.g., the phone land line so stepdaughter can call father long distance in Denver City 2xweek, the food budget which takes into account the health problems of the Ms. Ferguson, the charitable contributions which are below the 15% level and appear to have been part of a regular giving pattern and therefore are specifically permitted by § 1325(b)(2)(A), and of course the health insurance, medication and counseling expenses for the child with epilepsy, even though he has moved out of the house, unless there is a showing that he can afford those expenses himself.

But other than as set out above, I don't think that I can say what is reasonable and what is not, and so I leave that to the Debtors and the trustee and the creditors to work out, or to raise again at another hearing. Of course, what it may require to confirm a plan is extending the plan beyond 36 months, or making higher payments, or both, but this plan is not confirmable.

AD tdo.