

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
HAMMOND DIVISION AT LAFAYETTE

IN THE MATTER OF: )  
 )  
CONSOLIDATED INDUSTRIES CORP. ) CASE NO. 98-40533  
 )  
 )  
Debtor )

**DECISION AND ORDER DENYING OBJECTION TO CLAIM**

At Fort Wayne, Indiana, on August 28, 2007.

The trustee has objected to two claims filed on behalf of L.D. and Janeice Pyle designated by the clerk as claim number 140 and claim number 144. There has been no response to this objection within the time required by the local rules of this court, N.D. Ind. L.B.R. B-3007-1(b), and the matter is now before the court.

As to claim number 140, the trustee asks that it be denied because it has been “superseded and/or duplicated” by claim number 144. Unfortunately, he does not specify which shortcoming he is complaining about, and it matters. If claim number 140 has been duplicated by claim number 144 - so that the creditor has literally filed the same claim twice - the objection is well taken. The creditor is entitled to only one claim against the estate. If, however, claim number 140 has been superseded by claim number 144, the trustee does not even need to address it. It is no longer pending before the court and of no further force or effect. Cf. 188 LLC v. Trinity Industries, Inc., 300 F. 3d 730,736 (7th Cir. 2002) (“An amended pleading ordinarily supersedes the prior pleading. The prior pleading is in effect withdrawn . . . and becomes functus officio.”); Kelley v. Crosfield Catalysts, 135 F. 3d 1202,1204-1205 (7th Cir. 1998) (same).

As for claim number 144, the trustee’s objection states that it “should be allowed as a general

unsecured claim in the amount of \$719.00.” Unfortunately, the trustee does not identify what the problem with this particular claim might be. See, N.D. Ind. L.B.R. B-3007-1(b) (“An objection to a proof of claim shall . . . state with specificity the basis for disallowance or allowance in an amount . . . other than that claimed.”) See also, Fed. R. Bankr. P. Rule 9013 (“A motion shall state with particularity the grounds therefore and the relief sought.”). Claims are deemed allowed unless objected to. See, 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). “[T]o be proper, an objection to a proof of claim must allege facts which, if accepted as true, would trigger one of the statutory reasons for denying a claim. If it does not, the objection should not be sustained. This remains true even if the creditor lacks sufficient interest to respond.” In re Taylor, 289 B.R. 379, 384 (Bankr. N.D. Ind. 2003). All the trustee has done is object to the claim, he has not explained why. This is not sufficient.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the trustee’s objection to the claims of L.D. and Janeice Pyle is overruled, without prejudice.

/s/ Robert E. Grant  
Judge, United States Bankruptcy Court