

Real Property & Title Insurance Update: Week Ending April 14 & 21, 2017

April 24, 2017

REAL PROPERTY UPDATE

- Foreclosure/Attorneys' Fees: mortgage foreclosure plaintiffs seeking attorney's fees must support their claim with competent, substantial evidence of the number of hours worked and evidence that those hours and hourly rate are reasonable Henderson v. Onewest Bank FSB, No. 1D16-2670 (Fla. 1st DCA April 18, 2017) (reversed and remanded in part).
- Foreclosure/Standing: plaintiff failed to provide evidence that indorsee had intent to transfer any interest to plaintiff when note was transferred into trust Shaffer v. Deutsche Bank National Trust, as Indenture Trustee for American Home Mortgage Investment Trust 2006-1, Mortgage Backed Notes, Series 2006-1, No. 2D14-4205 (Fla. 2d DCA April 19, 2017) (reversed and remanded).
- HOA/Summary Judgment: trial court erred in entering final summary judgment in favor of homeowners' association, where conflicting affidavits evinced disputed issues regarding owner's property and her compliance with recorded restrictions - Sexton v. Southfield Subdivision Maintenance and Property Owners' Association, Inc., No. 2D16-3567 (Fla. 2d DCA April 19, 2017) (reversed and remanded).
- Foreclosure/Lack of Prosecution: "close enough" is not "good enough" where plaintiff's good cause showing was filed 4 days before hearing, as opposed to minimum 5 day requirement under rule 1.420(e) Held v. U.S. Bank National Association, as Trustee for C-BASS 2007-CB7 Trust, Mortgage Loan Asset-Backed Certificates, Series 2006-CB7, et al., No. 4D15-499 (Fla. 4th DCA April 19, 2017) (reversed and remanded).

- Foreclosure/Standing: plaintiff, as nonholder in possession, failed to prove series of transactions through which it acquired note starting with first holder of note Powell v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. as Trustee for Structured Asset Mortgage Investments II, Inc., GreenPoint Mortgage Funding Trust 2006-AR2, Mortgage Pass-Through Certificates, Series 2006-AR2, No. 4D15-3013 (Fla. 4th DCA April 19, 2017) (reversed and remanded).
- Foreclosure/Appeal: order granting summary judgment for borrowers and dismissing case without prejudice to lender's filing a new foreclosure action was final appealable order - Bank of New York Mellon v. Swain, No. 5D16-139 (Fla. 5th DCA April 21, 2017) (dismissed).
- Foreclosure/Conditions Precedent: plaintiff's notice of default substantially complied with notice provision contained in paragraph 22 of mortgage U.S. Bank Trust, N.A., etc. v. Wellman, No. 3D15-1368 (Fla. 3d DCA Apr. 12, 2017) (reversed and remanded)
- Dismissal with Prejudice: trial court improperly dismissed with prejudice pro se plaintiff's complaint against lender for, among other things, unauthorized entry and conversion of personal property, and plaintiff should have been permitted to amend Hanna-Mack v. Bank of Am., N.A., No. 3D16-1897 (Fla. 3d DCA Apr. 12, 2017) (reversed and remanded to permit amendment of complaint)
- Foreclosure/Assignment of Rents: where there was no agreement between the parties to assign
 rents or other basis for sequestering rents, and the rents were not the subject of the litigation, trial
 court lacked authority to order that rents be deposited into court registry UV Cite III, LLC v.
 Deutsche Bank Nat'l Trust Co., as Trustee, No. 3D16-2341 (Fla. 3d DCA Apr. 12, 2017) (reversed
 and remanded)
- Foreclosure/Attorneys' Fees: party that successfully prevailed in obtaining dismissal with
 prejudice of foreclosure action based on lack of standing pursuant to contract sued upon not
 entitled to an attorneys' fees award pursuant to contract's attorneys' fee provision Nationstar
 Mortg. LLC v. Glass, No. 4D15-4561 (Fla. 4th DCA Apr. 12, 2017) (denying motion for fees, and
 denying without prejudice request for costs)
- Foreclosure/Reverse Mortgage: language in reverse mortgage was patently ambiguous regarding whether spouse of decedent was a "borrower" under its terms, and extrinsic evidence was necessary to resolve this factual question Nationstar Mortg. Co. v. Levine, No. 4D16-615 (Fla. 4th DCA Apr. 12, 2017) (reversing entry of summary judgment)
- Foreclosure/Business Records Hearsay Exception: bank satisfied predicate necessary for
 admission of prior servicers' loan payment histories, having presented detailed testimony
 regarding the "on-boarding" process utilized by current servicer to verify information received
 from prior servicers Bank of New York Mellon f/k/a Bank of New York Successor Trustee v.
 Vessels, No. 5D15-4248 (Fla. 5th DCA Apr. 13, 2017) (reversed and remanded for new trial on
 issue of damages)

TITLE INSURANCE UPDATE

- Duty to Defend: duty to indemnify is a contractual one dictated by title policy provisions, and insurer is required to indemnify insured under Section 9(b) of an ALTA 2006 Extended Lender's policy where deed was invalid and unenforceable as an unauthorized conveyance in a Ponzi scheme Banner Bank v. First American Title Ins. Co., Case No. 2:16-CV-00200-BSJ (D. Utah. Apr. 12, 2017)(granting summary judgment in favor of insured)
- Duty to Defend: title defect not exempt from coverage under Exclusion 6 of an ALTA 2006
 Extended Lender's policy for unauthorized conveyances that violate the Securities Act of 1933
 and Exchange Act of 1934, and Rules 10(b) and 10b-5 because the Exclusion only applies to
 fraudulent conveyances or transfers pursuant to federal bankruptcy, state insolvency or similar
 creditors' rights laws Banner Bank v. First American Title Ins. Co., Case No. 2:16-CV-00200-BSJ
 (D. Utah. Apr. 12, 2017)(granting summary judgment in favor of insured)
- Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing: insurer breached implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing when it failed to diligently investigate, fairly evaluate, and promptly and reasonably act in rejecting or settling claim for indemnity as a result of unauthorized conveyances, where insurer took four months to respond and had not investigated or evaluated the insured's reading of claim documents Banner Bank v. First American Title Ins. Co., Case No. 2:16-CV-00200-BSJ (D. Utah. Apr. 12, 2017)(granting summary judgment in favor of insured)
- Paragraph 15(b) Applicability: summary judgment should not have been entered in favor of insurer based upon paragraph 15(b) of policy when insured also sued for negligent provision of real estate transaction services and policy did not include property at issue. Michael v. Stock, Case No. 1229 EDA 2016 (Pa. Sup. Ct. Apr. 11, 2017) (vacating award of summary judgment in favor of title insurer).
- Estoppel: insured's argument that insurer's failure to properly search title records and properly issue policy insuring entirety of property purchased by insured precluded summary judgment on coverage issue in favor of insurer. Michael v. Stock, Case No. 1229 EDA 2016 (Pa. Sup. Ct. Apr. 11, 2017) (vacating award of summary judgment in favor of title insurer).
- Bad faith: Pennsylvania's bad faith statute creates independent cause of action to insured which
 is not dependent on success of coverage dispute and thus trial court's reasoning regarding
 existence of coverage was not determinative of insured's bad faith claims. Michael v. Stock, Case
 No. 1229 EDA 2016 (Pa. Sup. Ct. Apr. 11, 2017) (vacating award of summary judgment in favor of
 title insurer).
- Defective Description Exception: insurer had no duty to defend because defective description
 exception that expressly stated insurer could not insure a description based on acreage –
 excludes coverage for any claims related to legal description. Fischer Sand & Aggregate, LLP v.
 Old Republic National Title Ins. Co., Case No. A16-0988 (Minn. Ct. App. Apr. 10, 2017).

 Survey Exception: insurer was entitled to summary judgment when an accurate survey would have disclosed boundary and insured failed to provide survey to clear exception. Fischer Sand & Aggregate, LLP v. Old Republic National Title Ins. Co., Case No. A16-0988 (Minn. Ct. App. Apr. 10, 2017).

Related Practices

Title Insurance
Real Property Litigation
Consumer Finance

©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.