

Citimortgage, Inc. v Rodriguez
2014 NY Slip Op 31889(U)
April 4, 2014
Sup Ct, Suffolk County
Docket Number: 40469-10
Judge: Joseph C. Pastoressa
Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op <u>30001</u> (U), are republished from various state and local government websites. These include the New York State Unified Court System's E-Courts Service, and the Bronx County Clerk's office.
This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

SUPREME COURT - STATE OF NEW YORK
IAS PART 34 - SUFFOLK COUNTY

COPY

PRESENT: Hon. JOSEPH C. PASTORESSA
Justice of the Supreme Court

MOTION DATE 7-31-13
ADJ. DATE _____
Mot. Seq. #001-MG

CITIMORTGAGE, INC. x

Plaintiff,

KATZ & RYCHIK, P.C.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
30 Broad Street, 8th floor
N. Y., N. Y. 10004

-against-

EUGENIO RODRIGUEZ AKA EUGUENIO
RODRIGUEZ, ANGELICA JUDITH QUILLA AKA
ANGELICA QUILLA

EUGENIO RODRIGUEZ
ANGELICA QUILLA
Defendants Pro Se
99 Edgewood Avenue
Smithtown, N. Y. 11787

"JOHN DOE #1" through "JOHN DOE #12", the
last twelve names being fictitious and unknown to
plaintiff, the persons or parties intended being the
tenants, occupants, persons or corporations, if any
having or claiming as interest in or lien upon the
premises, described in the complaint,

Defendants.

x

Upon the following papers numbered 1 to 10 read on this motion for summary judgment; Notice of Motion/Order to Show Cause and supporting papers 1 - 10; Notice of Cross Motion and supporting papers _____; Answering Affidavits and supporting papers _____; Replying Affidavits and supporting papers _____; Other _____; (~~and after hearing counsel in support and opposed to the motion~~) it is,

ORDERED that this motion by the plaintiff/counterclaim-defendant for, inter alia, an order:
(1) pursuant to CPLR 3212 awarding summary judgment in its favor and against the defendant/counterclaim-plaintiffs Eugenio Rodriguez and Angelica Judith Quilla, striking their answer and dismissing the affirmative defenses and counterclaims set forth therein; (2) pursuant to CPLR 3215 fixing the defaults of the non-answering defendants; (3) pursuant to RPAPL § 1321 appointing a referee to (a) compute amounts due under the subject mortgage; and (b) examine and report whether the subject premises should be sold in one parcel or multiple parcels; and (4) amending the caption is granted; and it is

CitiMortgage Inc. v Rodriguez, et. al.

Index No.: 40469-10

Pg. 2

ORDERED that the plaintiff is directed to file proof of filing of an additional or a successive notice of pendency with the proposed judgment of foreclosure (*see*, CPLR 6513; 6516[a]; *Aames Funding Corp. v Houston*, 57 AD3d 808, 872 NYS2d 134 [2d Dept 2008]; *EMC Mtge. Corp. v Stewart*, 2 AD3d 772, 769 NYS2d 408 [2d Dept 2003]; *Horowitz v Griggs*, 2 AD3d 404, 767 NYS2d 860 [2d Dept 2003]); and it is

ORDERED that the plaintiff is directed to serve a copy of this order amending the caption upon the Calendar Clerk of this Court; and it is further

ORDERED that the plaintiff is directed to serve a copy of this Order with notice of entry upon all parties who have appeared herein and not waived further notice pursuant to CPLR 2103(b)(1), (2) or (3) within thirty (30) days of the date herein, and to promptly file the affidavits of service with the Clerk of the Court.

This is an action to foreclose a mortgage on residential real property known as 99 Edgewood Avenue, Smithtown, New York 11787. On October 23, 2008, the defendants Eugenio Rodriguez and Angelica Judith Quilla (the defendant mortgagors) executed a fixed-rate note in favor of All American Home Mortgage Corp. (the lender) in the principal sum of \$708,750.00. To secure said note, the defendant mortgagors gave the lender a mortgage also dated October 23, 2008 on the property. The mortgage indicates that Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. (MERS) was acting solely as a nominee for the lender and its successors and assigns and that, for the purposes of recording the mortgage, MERS was the mortgagee of record. By way of an endorsed note with physical delivery prior to commencement, the note and the mortgage were transferred to CitiMortgage, Inc. (the plaintiff), memorialized by an assignment of the mortgage dated October 18, 2010. The assignment was subsequently duly recorded in the Suffolk County Clerk's Office on November 15, 2010.

The defendant mortgagors allegedly defaulted on the note and mortgage by failing to make the monthly payment of principal and interest due on or about April 1, 2010, and each month thereafter. After the defendant mortgagors allegedly failed to cure their default, the plaintiff commenced the instant action by the filing of a lis pendens, summons and verified complaint on November 1, 2010. Parenthetically, the lis pendens has now expired.

Issue was joined by the interposition of the defendant mortgagors' answer dated November 17, 2010. By their answer, the defendant mortgagors admit the execution of the note and mortgage, but generally deny the remaining allegations in the complaint. The defendant mortgagors also assert three affirmative defenses and a counterclaim, alleging, among other things, failure to properly notify them as required by New York State Bank Laws; culpable conduct on the part of the plaintiff; and failure to state a cause of action. By their counterclaims, the defendant mortgagors seek a temporary stay in this action for the purposes of seeking of loan modification, but do not request any monetary damages. In its reply dated December 7, 2010, the plaintiff denies all of the allegations in the counterclaim and asserts twenty-one affirmative defenses. The remaining defendants have neither answered nor appeared.

CitiMortgage Inc. v Rodriguez, et. al.

Index No.: 40469-10

Pg. 3

According to the records maintained by the Court's computerized database, settlement conferences were conducted or adjourned before this Court's specialized mortgage foreclosure part on July 7 and August 9, 2011. On the second date, this case was dismissed from the conference program as the parties were unable to reach a settlement. Thereafter, six additional settlement conferences were conducted or adjourned before Foreclosure Conference Part 34 six times beginning on November 8, 2012 and lasting until August 1, 2013. A representative of the plaintiff attended and participated in all settlement conferences. At the last conference, this action was marked to indicate that the parties could not reach an agreement to modify the loan or otherwise settle this action. Accordingly, there has been compliance with CPLR 3408, and no further conference is required under any statute, law or rule.

The plaintiff now moves for, inter alia, an order: (1) pursuant to CPLR 3212 awarding summary judgment in its favor and against the defendant mortgagors, striking their answer and dismissing the affirmative defenses and counterclaims set forth therein; (2) pursuant to CPLR 3215 fixing the defaults of the non-answering defendants; (3) pursuant to RPAPL § 1321 appointing a referee to (a) compute amounts due under the subject mortgage; and (b) examine and report whether the subject premises should be sold in one parcel or multiple parcels; and (4) amending the caption. No opposition has been filed in response to this motion.

A plaintiff in a mortgage foreclosure action establishes a prima facie case for summary judgment by submission of the mortgage, the note, bond or obligation, and evidence of default (*see, Valley Natl. Bank v Deutsch*, 88 AD3d 691, 930 NYS2d 477 [2d Dept 2011]; *Wells Fargo Bank v Das Karla*, 71 AD3d 1006, 896 NYS2d 681 [2d Dept 2010]; *Washington Mut. Bank, F.A. v O'Connor*, 63 AD3d 832, 880 NYS2d 696 [2d Dept 2009]). The burden then shifts to the defendant to demonstrate "the existence of a triable issue of fact as to a bona fide defense to the action, such as waiver, estoppel, bad faith, fraud, or oppressive or unconscionable conduct on the part of the plaintiff" (*Capstone Bus. Credit, LLC v Imperia Family Realty, LLC*, 70 AD3d 882, 883, 895 NYS2d 199 [2d Dept 2010], *quoting Mahopac Natl. Bank v Baisley*, 244 AD2d 466, 467, 644 NYS2d 345 [2d Dept 1997]).

By its submissions, the plaintiff established its prima facie entitlement to summary judgment on the complaint (*see, CPLR 3212; RPAPL § 1321; Wachovia Bank, N.A. v Carcano*, 106 AD3d 724, 965 NYS2d 516 [2d Dept 2013]; *U.S. Bank, N.A. v Denaro*, 98 AD3d 964, 950 NYS2d 581 [2d Dept 2012]; *Capital One, N.A. v Knollwood Props. II, LLC*, 98 AD3d 707, 950 NYS2d 482 [2d Dept 2012]). In the instant case, the plaintiff produced, inter alia, the endorsed note, the mortgage, the assignment and evidence of nonpayment (*see, Federal Home Loan Mtge. Corp. v Karastathis*, 237 AD2d 558, 655 NYS2d 631 [2d Dept 1997]; *First Trust Natl. Assn. v Meisels*, 234 AD2d 414, 651 NYS2d 121 [2d Dept 1996]). The plaintiff also submitted proof of compliance with the notice requirements of RPAPL §§ 1303 and 1304 (*see, Castle Peak 2012-I Trust v Choudhury*, 2013 NY Misc LEXIS 5510, 2013 WL 6229919, 2013 NY Slip Op 32971 [U] [Sup Ct, Queens County 2013]; *M & T Bank v Romero*, 40 Misc3d 1210 [A], 977 NYS2d 667 [Sup Ct, Suffolk County 2013]; *cf., Aurora Loan Servs., LLC v Weisblum*, 85 AD3d 95, 923 NYS2d 609 [2d Dept 2011]). Under these circumstances, the plaintiff demonstrated its prima facie burden as to the merits of this foreclosure action.

CitiMortgage Inc. v Rodriguez, et. al.

Index No.: 40469-10

Pg. 4

The plaintiff also submitted sufficient proof to establish, prima facie, that the affirmative defenses set forth in the defendant mortgagors' answer are subject to dismissal due to their unmeritorious nature (*see, Becher v Feller*, 64 AD3d 672, 884 NYS2d 83 [2d Dept 2009]; *Wells Fargo Bank Minn., N.A. v Perez*, 41 AD3d 590, 837 NYS2d 877 [2d Dept 2007]; *Coppa v Fabozzi*, 5 AD3d 718, 773 NYS2d 604 [2d Dept 2004] [unsupported affirmative defenses are lacking in merit]; *see also, Washington Mut. Bank v Schenk*, 112 AD3d 615, 975 NYS2d 902 [2d Dept 2013]; *JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. v Ilardo*, 36 Misc3d 359, 940 NYS2d 829 [Sup Ct, Suffolk County 2012] [plaintiff not obligated to accept a tender of less than full repayment as demanded]; *Grogg v South Rd. Assoc., L.P.*, 74 AD3d 1021, 907 NYS2d 22 [2d Dept 2010] [the mere denial of receipt of the notice of default is insufficient to rebut the presumption of delivery]; *La Salle Bank N.A. v Kosarovich*, 31 AD3d 904, 820 NYS2d 144 [3d Dept 2006]; *CFSC Capital Corp. XXVII v Bachman Mech. Sheet Metal Co.*, 247 AD2d 502, 669 NYS2d 329 [2d Dept 1998] [an affirmative defense based upon the notion of culpable conduct is unavailable in a foreclosure action]).

As the plaintiff duly demonstrated its entitlement to judgment as a matter of law, the burden of proof shifted to the defendant mortgagors (*see, HSBC Bank USA v Merrill*, 37 AD3d 899, 830 NYS2d 598 [3d Dept 2007]). Accordingly, it was incumbent upon the defendant mortgagors to produce evidentiary proof in admissible form sufficient to demonstrate the existence of a triable issue of fact as to a bona fide defense to the action (*see, Baron Assoc., LLC v Garcia Group Enters., Inc.*, 96 AD3d 793, 946 NYS2d 611 [2d Dept 2012]; *Washington Mut. Bank v Valencia*, 92 AD3d 774, 939 NYS2d 73 [2d Dept 2012]).

Self-serving and conclusory allegations do not raise issues of fact, and do not require the plaintiff to respond to alleged affirmative defenses which are based on such allegations (*see, Charter One Bank, FSB v Leone*, 45 AD3d 958, 845 NYS2d 513 [2d Dept 2007]; *Rosen Auto Leasing, Inc. v Jacobs*, 9 AD3d 798, 780 NYS2d 438 [3d Dept 2004]). In instances where a defendant fails to oppose a motion for summary judgment, the facts, as alleged in the moving papers, may be deemed admitted and there is, in effect, a concession that no question of fact exists (*see, Kuehne & Nagel, Inc. v Baiden*, 36 NY2d 539, 369 NYS2d 667 [1975]; *see also, Madeline D'Anthony Enters., Inc. v Sokolowsky*, 101 AD3d 606, 957 NYS2d 88 [1st Dept 2012]; *Argent Mtge. Co., LLC v Mentasana*, 79 AD3d 1079, 915 NYS2d 591 [2d Dept 2010]). Additionally, "uncontradicted facts are deemed admitted" (*Tortorello v Carlin*, 260 AD2d 201, 206, 688 NYS2d 64 [1st Dept 1999] [internal quotation marks and citations omitted]).

The defendant mortgagors' answer is insufficient, as a matter of law, to defeat the plaintiff's unopposed motion (*see, Flagstar Bank v Bellafiore*, 94 AD3d 1044, 943 NYS2d 551 [2d Dept 2012]; *Argent Mtge. Co., LLC v Mentasana*, 79 AD3d 1079, *supra*). In this case, the affirmative defenses asserted by the defendant mortgagors are factually unsupported and without apparent merit (*see, Becher v Feller*, 64 AD3d 672, *supra*). In any event, the failure by the defendant mortgagors to raise and/or assert their pleaded defenses and counterclaim in opposition to the plaintiff's motion warrants the dismissal of the same as abandoned under the case authorities cited above (*see, Kuehne & Nagel v Baiden*, 36 NY2d 539, *supra*; *see also, Madeline D'Anthony Enters., Inc. v Sokolowsky*, 101 AD3d 606, *supra*).

CitiMortgage Inc. v Rodriguez, et. al.

Index No.: 40469-10

Pg. 5

Under these circumstances, the Court finds that the defendant mortgagors failed to rebut the plaintiff's prima facie showing of its entitlement to summary judgment requested by it (*see, Flagstar Bank v Bellafiore*, 94 AD3d 1044, *supra*; *Argent Mtge. Co., LLC v Mentasana*, 79 AD3d 1079, *supra*; *Rossrock Fund II, L.P. v Commack Inv. Group, Inc.*, 78 AD3d 920, 912 NYS2d 71 [2d Dept 2010]; *see generally, Hermitage Ins. Co. v Trance Nite Club, Inc.*, 40 AD3d 1032, 834 NYS2d 870 [2d Dept 2007]). The plaintiff, therefore, is awarded summary judgment in its favor against the defendant mortgagors (*see, Federal Home Loan Mtge. Corp. v Karastathis*, 237 AD2d 558, *supra*; *see generally, Zuckerman v City of New York*, 49 NY2d 557, 427 NYS2d 595 [1980]). Accordingly, the defendant mortgagors' answer is stricken, and the affirmative defenses and counterclaim set forth therein are dismissed.

The branch of the instant motion wherein the plaintiff seeks an order pursuant to CPLR 1024 amending the caption by substituting Pedro Camone for the fictitious defendant John Doe #1, and excising the names of the remaining fictitious defendants, John Doe #2-12, is granted (*see, PHH Mtge. Corp. v Davis*, 111 AD3d 1110, 975 NYS2d 480 [3d Dept 2013]; *Flagstar Bank v Bellafiore*, 94 AD3d 1044, *supra*; *Neighborhood Hous. Servs. of N.Y. City, Inc. v Meltzer*, 67 AD3d 872, 889 NYS2d 627 [2d Dept 2009]). By its submissions, the plaintiff established the basis for the above-noted relief. All future proceedings shall be captioned accordingly.

By its moving papers, the plaintiff further established the default in answering on the part of the newly substituted defendant, Pedro Camone (Camone) (*see, RPAPL § 1321; HSBC Bank USA, N.A. v Roldan*, 80 AD3d 566, 914 NYS2d 647 [2d Dept 2011]). Accordingly, the default of the above-noted defendant, Camone, is fixed and determined. Since the plaintiff has been awarded summary judgment against the defendant mortgagors, and has established the default in answering by Camone, the plaintiff is entitled to an order appointing a referee to compute amounts due under the subject note and mortgage (*see, RPAPL § 1321; Ocwen Fed. Bank FSB v Miller*, 18 AD3d 527, 794 NYS2d 650 [2d Dept 2005]; *Vermont Fed. Bank v Chase*, 226 AD2d 1034, 641 NYS2d 440 [3d Dept 1996]; *Bank of E. Asia v Smith*, 201 AD2d 522, 607 NYS2d 431 [2d Dept 1994]).

Accordingly, this motion for, inter alia, summary judgment and an order of reference is granted. The proposed long form order appointing a referee to compute pursuant to RPAPL § 1321, as modified by the Court, has been signed concurrently herewith.

Dated: April 4, 2014


HON. JOSEPH C. PASTORESSA, J.S.C.

_____ FINAL DISPOSITION X NON-FINAL DISPOSITION