

1  
2 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
3 **IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

4 **In re TRAVER CHRISTOPHER** )  
5 **BIEHN,** )

**Chapter 7 Proceedings**  
**Case No. 2-05-03303-PHX-CGC**

6 )  
7 **Debtor.** )  
8 )

**UNDER ADVISEMENT DECISION**  
**RE: MOTION FOR RE-**  
**CONSIDERATION OF ORDER**  
**REQUIRING TURNOVER**

9 The issue presented to the Court is whether Arizona Revised Statute (A.R.S.) section 33-  
10 1126<sup>1</sup> may be applied to require turnover by Debtor Traver Biehn of approximately \$2,000 paid  
11 into to his 401(k) account during the 120 days prior to bankruptcy. The answer is no. Although  
12 the motion to reconsider will be granted, the matter requires explanation, as neither party  
13 properly analyzed the issue (nor did the Court in deciding the initial motion).

14 The United States Supreme Court in *Patterson v Shumate*, 504 U.S. 753 (1992),  
15 established that qualified plans that conform with ERISA are excluded from property of the  
16 estate by 11 U.S.C. section 541(c)(2). There is no dispute here that the debtor's 401(k) plan is  
17 "ERISA qualified." Thus, all funds in the plan on the petition date are excluded from the estate.  
18 Because the Arizona statute only applies to exempt from creditors' claims certain property of the  
19 estate, its application never arises in this situation where the funds in the 401(k) never were  
20

21 <sup>1</sup>A.R.S. section 33-1126, in relevant part, provides as follows:

22 **B.** Any money or other assets payable to a participant in or beneficiary of, or any interest  
23 of any participant or beneficiary in, a retirement plan under § 401(a), 403(a), 403(b), 408, 408A  
24 or 409 or a deferred compensation plan under § 457 of the United States internal revenue code of  
25 1986, as amended, shall be exempt from any and all claims of creditors of the beneficiary or  
participant. This subsection shall not apply to any of the following:

26 \*

27 \*

28 \*

2. Amounts contributed within one hundred twenty days before a debtor files for  
bankruptcy.

1 property of the estate. *Patterson* remains good law and its holding is explicit.<sup>2</sup>

2 The Trustee urged at oral argument that such a holding would encourage “loading up” by  
3 debtors’ transferring non-exempt assets into qualified plans on the eve of bankruptcy. This  
4 concern is ill founded. First, contributions to employer-sponsored qualified plans (the only type  
5 of plans governed by ERISA) are tightly controlled and strictly limited, both in type and  
6 amount, by both federal law and the plans themselves. Second, A.R.S. section 33-1126 remains  
7 applicable to other non-qualified ERISA plans, most notably IRA’s (authorized under IRC  
8 section 408), or any other retirement vehicle authorized under any of the cited sections of the  
9 IRC in section 33-1126, except those specifically relating to ERISA qualified plans. The reach  
10 back provisions of A.R.S. section 33-1126 will therefore continue to limit the exemption a  
11 debtor can claim for IRA contributions.

12 In short, the critical issue in determining the applicability of Section 33-1126(B) to  
13 retirement plans is whether they are ERISA qualified: 401K plans are, IRA’s are not. The same  
14 question must be asked for any other type of retirement vehicle authorized under any of the cited  
15 sections of the IRC.

16 Therefore, Debtor’s motion for reconsideration is granted. Debtor is to submit a form of  
17 order consistent with this decision for the Court’s signature.

18 So ordered.

19 **DATED: March 28, 2006**

20  
21   
22 CHARLES G. CASE II  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

23 **COPY** of the foregoing mailed or sent  
24 via facsimile this 28th day of  
25 March, 2006, to:  
26 \_\_\_\_\_

27 <sup>2</sup>The decision in *Reed v. Drummond (In re Reed)*, 985 F.2d 1026 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993), issued post-  
28 *Patterson* and upon remand after *Patterson*, simply reaffirmed this principle. The first *Reed*  
case, *Reed v. Drummond (In re Reed)*, 951 F.2d 1046 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991), has no bearing on the issue  
as it was specifically withdrawn by the Ninth Circuit.

1 Peter Gustafson  
2 Gustafson Law Office, PLLC  
3 18001 N. 79<sup>th</sup> Avenue, #B-35  
4 Glendale, Arizona 85308  
5 Attorney for Debtor

6 Alan Meda  
7 Stinson Morrison Hecker, LLP  
8 1850 N. Central Ave., Suite 2100  
9 Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
10 Attorneys for Trustee Lothar Goernitz

11 Lothar Goernitz  
12 P.O. Box 32961  
13 Phoenix, Arizona 85064-2961  
14 Trustee

15 U.S. Trustee  
16 230 N. First Avenue, Suite 204  
17 Phoenix, Arizona 85003

18 By: Shirley Dunbar, Judicial Assistant  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28