

The document below is hereby signed.

Signed: April 10, 2013



S. Martin Teel, Jr.

S. Martin Teel, Jr.
United States Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

In re)	
)	
GOSPEL RESCUE MINISTRIES OF)	Case No. 12-00405
WASHINGTON, D.C. INC.,)	(Chapter 11)
)	Not for publication in
Debtor.)	West's Bankruptcy Reporter.

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER RE OBJECTIONS TO VARIOUS CLAIMS

The debtor has objected to several claims (detailed below), seeking full disallowance of the claims. The debtor challenges each claim as excessive. Specifically, the objections are:

(1) Dkt. No. 196 (objection to claim of General

Electric Capital Corporation):

Debtor asserts that the Claimant did not provide services as required by the contract and disputes the value and extent of the services actually provided by Claimant. Further Claimant has inaccurately stated its pre-petition claim.

(2) Dkt. No. 202 (objection to claim of De Lage Landen

Financial Services):

Debtor asserts that the Claimant did not provide services as required by the contract and disputes the value and extent of the services actually provided by Claimant. Further Claimant has inaccurately stated its pre-petition claim.

(3) Dkt. No. 205 (objection to claim of Comptroller of Maryland):

The Claimant's proof of claim should be denied because the amount that the Claimant alleges is due and owing is inaccurate and the proofs of claim provide insufficient detail to validate the claim.

(4) Dkt. No. 211 (objection to claim of MegaPath Corporation):

Debtor asserts that the Claimant did not provide services as required by the contract and disputes the value and extent of the services actually provided by Claimant. In addition, the Claimant improperly charged fees and expenses, including cancellation fees, even though service was not terminated and was, in fact, reinstated.

(5) Dkt. No. 226 (objection to claim of Colonial Life Insurance):

The Court should disallow or strike the scheduled claim because Claimant improperly charged fees and expenses. In addition, Claimant did not provide the services in accordance with the agreement, and Debtor disputes the actual value of the services provided by Claimant.

There have been no responses to these objections. The debtor, however, has not specified the amount of each claim that it concedes is owed, nor has it included with the objection evidence (such as an affidavit) to rebut the prima facie validity of the claim. Even if the claims are not entitled to be treated as prima facie valid, the lack of a response does not suffice to warrant disallowing the claims. The debtor acknowledges that some amount may be owed on each claim, but fails to acknowledge what amount is

owed.¹ A party objecting to a claim because it is excessive has an obligation to indicate the amount that it concedes is owed. It is thus

ORDERED that within 35 days after entry of this order, the debtor shall file affidavits establishing the amounts owed on each claim, and establishing the amounts that are excessive, and serve those affidavits on the respective claimants.

[Signed and dated above.]

¹ The objection that the Comptroller of Maryland "provide[d] insufficient detail to validate the claim" is not a basis for disallowance of that claim. If the claim is owed, it is not to be disallowed based on an objection that there has been a failure to provide with the proof of claim detail validating the claim.

