

**JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. v Galinkin**

2014 NY Slip Op 32827(U)

October 29, 2014

Supreme Court, Suffolk County

Docket Number: 25538-12

Judge: Jerry Garguilo

Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op 30001(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.

SHORT FORM ORDER

INDEX  
NO.: 25538-12

## SUPREME COURT - STATE OF NEW YORK IAS PART 47 - SUFFOLK COUNTY

**PRESENT: Hon. JERRY GARGUILO**  
Justice of the Supreme Court

\_\_\_\_\_  
JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION,

Plaintiff,

-against-

IVAN A. GALINKIN  
"JOHN DOE #1 to "JOHN DOE #10", the last 10  
names being fictitious and unknown to plaintiff, t he  
persons or parties intended being the persons or  
parties, if any, having or claiming an interest in or  
lien upon the mortgaged premises described in the  
verified complaint,

Defendants.

MOTION DATE: 5-28-14  
ADJ. DATE: 10/29/14  
Mot. Seq. # 001-MotD

McCABE, WEISBERG & CONWAY, P.C.  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
145 Huguenot Street, Suite 210  
New Rochelle, N. Y. 10801

IVAN A. GALINKIN  
Defendant Pro Se  
104 Wedgewood Drive  
Coram, N. Y. 11727

\_\_\_\_\_  
X

Upon the following papers numbered 1 to 14 read on this motion for summary judgment; Notice of Motion/Order to Show Cause and supporting papers 1 - 14; 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 unopposed motion by the plaintiff for, inter alia, an order awarding summary judgment in its favor against the defendant Ivan A. Galinkin, fixing the defaults of the non-answering defendants, appointing a referee and amending the caption is determined as indicated below; 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.

RR

This is an action to foreclose a mortgage on real property known as 104 Wedgewood Drive, Coram, New York 11727. On February 11, 2010, the defendant Ivan A. Galinkin (the defendant mortgagor) executed a fixed-rate note in favor of WCS Lending, LLC (the lender) in the principal sum of \$227,411.00. To secure said note, the defendant mortgagor gave the lender a mortgage also dated February 11, 2010 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 allonge with physical delivery, the note was allegedly transferred to the plaintiff, JPMorgan Chase Bank, National Association, on the date of commencement.

The defendant mortgagor allegedly defaulted on the note and mortgage by failing to make the monthly payment of principal and interest due on or about November 1, 2011, and each month thereafter. After the defendant mortgagor allegedly failed to cure the default in payment, the plaintiff commenced the instant action by the filing of a lis pendens, summons and verified complaint on August 20, 2012. Issue was joined by the interposition of the defendant mortgagor's verified answer sworn to on August 31, 2012. By his answer, the defendant mortgagor admits all of the allegations contained in the complaint, and asserts one affirmative defense, alleging, inter alia, the loss of income relating to personal misfortunes. The remaining defendants have neither answered, nor appeared.

In compliance with CPLR 3408, the parties began a prolonged period of negotiations in an attempt to agree on a loan modification and foreclosure settlement conferences were conducted or adjourned before this court's foreclosure conference part beginning on December 7, 2012 and lasting until February 26, 2014. A representative of the plaintiff attended and participated in all settlement conferences. On the last conference date, the parties were unable to modify the loan or otherwise reach a settlement. As a result, this action was dismissed from the conference program. Accordingly, the conference requirements imposed by CPLR 3408 have been satisfied; no further conference is required.

The plaintiff now moves for, inter alia, an order: (1) pursuant to CPLR 3212 awarding summary judgment in its favor and against the defendant mortgagor, and striking his answer and dismissing the affirmative defense 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]).

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. v Galinkin  
Index No.: 25538-12  
Pg. 3

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 note, the mortgage 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]). Thus, the plaintiff demonstrated its prima facie burden as to the merits of this foreclosure action.

The plaintiff also submitted sufficient proof to establish, prima facie, that the first affirmative defense set forth in the defendant mortgagor's answer is subject to dismissal due to its 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] [plaintiff not obligated to accept a tender of less than full repayment as demanded]; *Bank of N.Y. Mellon v Scura*, 102 AD3d 714, 961 NYS2d 185 [2d Dept 2013]; *Scarano v Scarano*, 63 AD3d 716, 880 NYS2d 682 [2d Dept 2009] [process server's sworn affidavit of service is prima facie evidence of proper service]; *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v Van Dyke*, 101 AD3d 638, 958 NYS2d 331 [1st Dept 2012]; *Long Is. Sav. Bank of Centereach, F.S.B. v Denkensohn*, 222 AD2d 659, 635 NYS2d 683 [2d Dept 1995] [dispute as to amount owed by the mortgagor is not a defense to a foreclosure action]; *Charter One Bank, FSB v Leone*, 45 AD3d 958, 845 NYS2d 513 [3d Dept 2007] [no competent evidence of an accord and satisfaction]). Furthermore, "when a mortgagor defaults on loan payments, even if only for a day, a mortgagee may accelerate the loan, require that the balance be tendered or commence foreclosure proceedings, and equity will not intervene" (*Home Sav. of Am., FSB v Isaacson*, 240 AD2d 633, 633, 659 NYS2d 94 [2d Dept 1997]).

As the plaintiff duly demonstrated its entitlement to judgment as a matter of law, the burden of proof shifted to the defendant mortgagor (*see*, *HSBC Bank USA v Merrill*, 37 AD3d 899, 830 NYS2d 598 [3d Dept 2007]). Accordingly, it was incumbent upon the defendant mortgagor 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 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 Mentosana*, 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 mortgagor's answer is insufficient, as a matter of law, to defeat the plaintiff's unopposed motion (see, *Flagstar Bank v Bellafigiore*, 94 AD3d 1044, 943 NYS2d 551 [2d Dept 2012]; *Argent Mtge. Co., LLC v Montesana*, 79 AD3d 1079, *supra*). In this case, the affirmative defense asserted by the defendant mortgagor is factually unsupported and without apparent merit (see, *Becher v Feller*, 64 AD3d 672, *supra*). In any event, the failure by the defendant mortgagor to raise and/or assert the pleaded defense 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*). Under these circumstances, the Court finds that the defendant mortgagor failed to rebut the plaintiff's prima facie showing of its entitlement to summary judgment requested by it (see, *Flagstar Bank v Bellafigiore*, 94 AD3d 1044, *supra*; *Argent Mtge. Co., LLC v Montesana*, 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 mortgagor (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 mortgagor's answer is stricken and the affirmative defense set forth therein is dismissed.

The branch of the instant motion wherein the plaintiff seeks an order pursuant to CPLR 1024 amending the caption by substituting "Jane Doe" (name refused) for the fictitious defendant, John Doe #1, and excising the remaining fictitious defendants, John Doe #2-10, is granted (see, *PHH Mtge. Corp. v Davis*, 111 AD3d 1110, 975 NYS2d 480 [3d Dept 2013]; *Flagstar Bank v Bellafigiore*, 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, "Jane Doe" (name refused) (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 is fixed and determined. Since the plaintiff has been awarded summary judgment against the defendant mortgagor, and has established the default in answering by the remaining defendant, the plaintiff is entitled to an order appointing a referee to compute amounts due under the subject note and mortgage (see, RPAPL § 1321; *Green Tree Servicing, LLC v Cary*, 106 AD3d 691, 965 NYS2d 511 [2d Dept 2013]; *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 is determined as set forth above. 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: 10/29/14

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. JERRY GARGUILO, J.S.C.

\_\_\_\_ FINAL DISPOSITION     NON-FINAL DISPOSITION