

NOT INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
FORT WAYNE DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
CONNIE S. TEEPLE) CASE NO. 13-12803
)
)
Debtor)

DECISION AND ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTION

On August 6, 2015

The debtor has objected to the trustee’s final report and proposed distribution. The only focus of that objection is how the estate is being distributed as to various creditors and administrative expenses. Although the debtor previously filed objection to these claims, including those for administrative expenses, all of her objections have been overruled for various reasons. See, Order Overruling Objection to Claim 4, dated Nov. 5, 2014; Order Overruling Objection to Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, dated Jan. 6, 2015; Order Overruling Debtor’s Objection, dated March 16, 2015; Order Overruling Debtor’s Objection, dated April 21, 2015. All of the objections relate to the trustee’s proposed distribution of the estate. As a general proposition, a chapter 7 debtor, who has been discharged, lacks standing to comment on the administration of the estate and its proposed distribution. See e.g., In re Cult Awareness Network, Inc., 151 F.3d 605, 607-08 (7th Cir. 1998) (chapter 7 debtors lack standing unless assets will revert to the debtor); In re T.G. Morgan, Inc., 394 B.R. 478, 483 (8th Cir. BAP 2008) (objectors lacked standing to object to the trustee’s final report because they would not benefit from any change to it); In re Ebel, 338 B.R. 862, 869 (Bankr. D. Colo. 2005) (chapter 7 debtor lacked standing to object to administration of the estate because the estate had no potential to generate any surplus for the debtor). This case is no different.

Nonetheless, as for the debtor’s objections to the proposed distribution, four of the creditors of which the debtor complains – Tammy Ames, Money Matters, City of Fort Wayne, and Ricky Hardisty – are not receiving any distribution at all; so there is no basis for any complaint. As to the creditors that are receiving a distribution, the debtor’s objection to the Indiana Department of Revenue’s Claim was overruled, Order Overruling Objection to Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, dated Jan. 6, 2015, so the claim has been allowed, 11 U.S.C. § 502, and it should receive a distribution. See, 11 U.S.C. § 726. The same is true of the Allen County Treasurer. See, Order Overruling Objection to Claim 4, dated Nov. 5, 2014. As for the administrative expense claims, the debtor’s objections to those applications for compensation have also been overruled. Order Overruling Debtor’s Objection, dated March 16, 2015; Order Overruling Debtor’s Objection, dated April 21, 2015. Furthermore, even if the requests for administrative expenses would be denied, the money would go to creditors, not the debtor. Thus, the debtor lacks standing to object to the distribution of property of the estate. See e.g., Cult Awareness Network, Inc., 151 F.3d at 607-08. Finally, the debtor’s present objection to the various administrative expenses - “Fees and administrative expenses for Dustin Roach and Associates. Really? How do you sleep at night? I will pray for you.” – fails to state any legal or factual basis for it. See, N.D. Ind. L.B.R. B-9014-1(a).

Based on the foregoing, no purpose would be served by holding a hearing, and the debtor’s objection to the trustee’s final report and proposed distribution is, therefore, OVERRULED.

SO ORDERED.

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