

**US Bank Natl. Assoc. v Rocco**

2014 NY Slip Op 32957(U)

November 3, 2014

Supreme Court, Suffolk County

Docket Number: 27306/2011

Judge: William B. Rebolini

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

**SUPREME COURT - STATE OF NEW YORK**

**I.A.S. PART 7 - SUFFOLK COUNTY**

**PRESENT:**

**WILLIAM B. REBOLINI**  
**Justice**

---

US Bank National Association, as Trustee for  
Credit Suisse First Boston Mortgage Securities  
Corp., CSAB Mortgage-Backed Trust 2006-4,  
CSAB Mortgage-Backed Pass-Through  
Certificates, Series 2006-4,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Mary A. Rocco, Suffolk County District Court,  
Kressel Rothlein Walsh & Roth, LLC, "John Doe  
#1" to "John Doe #10", the last 10 names being  
fictitious and unknown to plaintiff, the 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 Sequence No.: 001; MOT.D

Motion Date: 2/11/14

Submitted:

Index No.: 27306/2011

Attorney for Plaintiff:

McCabe, Weisberg & Conway, P.C.  
145 Huguenot Street, Suite 499  
New Rochelle, NY 10801

Attorney for Defendant Mary A. Rocco:

Adam C. Gomerman, Esq.  
807 E. Jericho Turnpike  
Huntington Station, NY 11746

Clerk of the Court

Upon the following papers numbered 1 to 10 read upon this motion for summary judgment:  
Notice of Motion and supporting papers, 1 - 10; it is

**ORDERED** that this unopposed motion by the plaintiff for, inter alia, an order awarding  
summary judgment in its favor against the defendant, Mary A. Rocco, 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 file proof of filing of an additional or a successive notice of pendency with the proposed judgment of foreclosure (*see*, CPLR 6513; 6516[a]; *Ames 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 real property known as 1020 Carll Drive, Bay Shore, New York 11706. On September 8, 2006, the defendant Mary A. Rocco (the defendant mortgagor) executed a fixed-rate note in favor of Wall Street Mortgage Bankers, Ltd. doing business as Power Express (the lender) in the principal sum of \$320,000.00. To secure said note, the defendant mortgagor gave the lender a mortgage also dated September 8, 2006 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 a blank endorsement, the note was allegedly transferred to the plaintiff, U.S. Bank National Association, as Trustee for Credit Suisse First Boston Mortgage Securities Corp., CSAB Mortgage-Backed Trust-2006-4, CSAB Mortgage-Backed Pass-Through Certificates, Series 2006-4, memorialized by an assignment of the mortgage dated July 22, 2011.

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, 2010, 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 22, 2011.

Issue was joined by the interposition of the defendant mortgagor's answer dated August 29, 2011. By her answer, the defendant mortgagor denies some of the allegations contained in the complaint, and admits other allegations therein, including the execution of the note and the mortgage by her and the property address. The defendant mortgagor also asserts five affirmative defenses, alleging, *inter alia*, the following: the lack of personal jurisdiction; the failure to state a cause of action; a fatally defective complaint; payment; and breach of contract. The defendant Kressel Rothlein Walsh & Roth, LLC (the Kressel firm) has appeared in this action and waived all, but certain, notices. The remaining defendants have neither answered, nor appeared.

In compliance with CPLR 3408, a foreclosure settlement conference was scheduled for April 2, 2012. On the aforementioned date, this action was dismissed from the conference program and referred as an IAS case because the defendant mortgagor did not appear or otherwise participate. Accordingly, 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 her answer and dismissing the affirmative defenses 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 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 affirmative defenses set forth in the defendant mortgagor's 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, 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 [1<sup>st</sup> 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 [1<sup>st</sup> 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 Bellafigliore*, 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 mortgagor are 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 each of her pleaded defenses 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 Bellafigliore*, 94 AD3d 1044, *supra*; *Argent Mtge. Co., LLC v Mentasana*, 79 AD3d 1079,

US Bank Nat'l. v. Rocco, et al.

Index No.: 27306/2011

Page 5

*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 defenses 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 Arthur Rocco for the fictitious defendant, John Doe #1, and by excising the remaining fictitious named 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 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. The plaintiff's submissions include an affidavit of service upon Arthur Rocco sued herein as John Doe #1. All future proceedings shall be captioned accordingly.

By its moving papers, the plaintiff further established the default in answering on the part of the defendants, Suffolk County District Court and the Kressel firm as well as the newly substituted defendant, Arthur Rocco (*see*, RPAPL § 1321; **HSBC Bank USA, N.A. v Roldan**, 80 AD3d 566, 914 NYS2d 647 [2d Dept 2011]). Accordingly, the defaults of all of the above-noted defendants are 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 defendants, 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:

11/3/2014

  
HON. WILLIAM B. REBOLINI, J.S.C.

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