

Georgia Court of Appeals Expands Lenders' Ability to Pursue Guarantor Deficiency Judgment Suits Beyond Foreclosure Confirmations

July 17, 2014

The Court of Appeals of Georgia further clarified Georgia's treatment of deficiency judgment suits against guarantors in instances where lenders cannot obtain foreclosure confirmations of secured property. *Community & Southern Bank v. DCB Investments, LLC, et al.*, A14A0717, Court of Appeals of Georgia, July 11, 2014. The case expands Georgia deficiency judgment law as articulated in *HWA Properties, Inc. v. Community & Southern Bank. DCB Investments* provides lenders guidance in two important respects. First, a lender seeking a deficiency judgment against a borrower on cross-collateralized and cross-defaulted notes must strictly conform to foreclosure procedure. Second, a lender can pursue a deficiency judgment against a guarantor even if the lender is unable to confirm the foreclosure(s) of all secured property so long as the guaranty specifies that (1) the guarantor's liability for the indebtedness on the loan is absolute and unconditional, (2) the guarantor waives all defenses, and (3) the guarantor's liability on the indebtedness extends beyond any foreclosure confirmation efforts by the lender. *DCB Investments* involved three cross-collateralized and cross-defaulted notes secured by real property as well as several personal guaranties. The lender and its predecessor foreclosed on both collateral properties but only confirmed one foreclosure. Thereafter, the lender sought to obtain a deficiency judgment against all obligors, pursuant to the notes and guaranties. Since the loans were cross-collateralized and cross-defaulted, the trial court determined that the lender could not pursue a deficiency judgment against any of the obligors since both foreclosures had not been confirmed. The Court first agreed with the trial court to find that the lender could not pursue a deficiency judgment against the borrower. Georgia's post-foreclosure deficiency procedures have been strictly construed, and the Court found nothing that supported departing from established procedure when a lender did not confirm all foreclosures of all secured property. Regarding the deficiency judgment against the guarantors, the Court reached a different

result, holding that the lender could pursue a deficiency judgment against the guarantors based on the guaranties' language. First, the guarantors had agreed to absolutely and unconditionally assume liability for all loans they guaranteed, even if the loans were cross-defaulted and cross-collateralized. Second, the guarantors had further agreed to expressly waive all defenses otherwise available to them, including the requirement that a lender confirm the foreclosures before seeking a deficiency against the guarantors. Third, the guaranties specified that the guarantors had further agreed to remain liable for any deficiencies remaining on the loans after foreclosure of the properties securing the notes, whether or not the liability of the borrower had otherwise been discharged pursuant to Georgia law. In approving its decision in *HWA Properties*, the Court further assured lenders that they may pursue deficiency judgments against delinquent guarantors, regardless of what occurs with foreclosure confirmations of collateral property.

Related Practices

[Appellate & Trial Support](#)

[Consumer Finance](#)

[Real Estate](#)

[Real Property Litigation](#)

Related Industries

[Real Estate](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.