

US Bank N.A. v Lepanto
2016 NY Slip Op 31811(U)
March 16, 2016
Supreme Court, Suffolk County
Docket Number: 4431/09
Judge: Thomas F. Whelan
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.

US Bank v Lepanto
Index No. 4431/09
Page 2

ORDERED that those portions of this motion (#001) by the plaintiff for an order awarding it summary judgment against the answering defendants, default judgment against the remaining defendants, for the appointment of a referee to compute, and the amendment of the caption is considered under CPLR 3212, 3215, 1003, 1024 and RPAPL § 1321 and is granted only to the extent that partial summary judgment in favor of the plaintiff dismissing all of the affirmative defenses and counterclaims set forth in the verified answer of defendants, Eugene Lepanto and Kathy Sokol (“answering defendants”), except the Fourth affirmative defenses; and it is further

ORDERED that those portions of this motion wherein the plaintiff seeks default judgments against the remaining known defendants served with process, and an order deleting the unknown defendants is considered under CPLR 1003, 1024 and is granted; and it is further

ORDERED that those portions of this motion wherein the plaintiff seeks an order appointing a referee to compute amounts due under the consolidated note and mortgage is denied without prejudice as premature; and it is further

ORDERED that pursuant to CPLR 3212(g), the court hereby finds that the sole remaining issue of fact is as to whether plaintiff is possessed of the requisite standing to prosecute its claims for foreclosure and sale and whether the plaintiff was either the holder of, or the assignee of, the underlying note when the action was commenced and that the trial of this action shall be limited to that issue; and it is further

ORDERED that pursuant to CPLR 3211(a)(3) and (b) the answering defendants’ cross motion (#002) to dismiss the action is denied; and it is further,

ORDERED that a pre-trial conference shall be held in this action on **March 29, 2016**, at 9:30 a.m. in Part 33, at the courthouse located at 1 Court Street - Annex, Riverhead, New York at which counsel are directed to appear.

The plaintiff commenced this action in February of 2009 to foreclose the lien of a mortgage given by the answering defendants on June 16, 2004 in favor of JP Morgan Chase Bank, plaintiff’s predecessor to secure a \$560,000.00 mortgage note of the same date likewise given to JP Morgan Chase Bank. According to the complaint, the answering defendants defaulted in their payment obligations on November 1, 2007, without cure notwithstanding the issuance of contractual and statutory notices of such default and demands for cure.

The answering defendants appeared in response to the plaintiff’s service of the summons and complaint by a verified answer with affirmative defenses and counter claims dated March 25, 2009. The remaining defendants served with process defaulted in appearing herein by answer.

By the instant motion (#001), the plaintiff seeks summary judgment dismissing the affirmative defenses and counter claims and an award of summary judgment on its complaint against

such defendants. The plaintiff also seeks default judgments against the known defendants and the deletion of the unknown defendants together with a caption amendment to reflect these party deletions. The motion is opposed by the answering defendants solely by a cross motion that only addresses the issue of plaintiff's standing. No other opposition is offered to the summary judgment motion. The plaintiff has replied.

For the reasons stated below, the motion is granted only to the extent set forth herein.

Entitlement to summary judgment in favor of the foreclosing plaintiff is established, prima facie, by the plaintiff's production of the mortgage and the unpaid note, and evidence of the default in payment (*see Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v Erobo*, 127 AD3d 1176, 9 NYS2d 312 [2d Dept 2015]; *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v DeSouza*, 126 AD3d 965, 3 NYS2d 619 [2d Dept 2015]; *OneWest Bank, FSB v DiPilato*, 124 AD3d 735, 998 NYS2d 668 [2d Dept 2015]; *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v Ali*, 122 AD3d 726, 995 NYS2d 735 [2d Dept 2014]). Where, the plaintiff's standing has been placed in issue by the defendant's answer, the plaintiff also must establish its standing as part of its prima facie showing (*see Aurora Loan Servs., LLC v Taylor*, 25 NY3d 355, 12 NYS3d 612 [2015]; *Loancare v Firshing*, 130 AD3d 787, 2015 WL 4256095 [2d Dept 2015]; *HSBC Bank USA, N.A. v Baptiste*, 128 AD3d 77, 10 NYS2d 255 [2d Dept 2015]).

A foreclosing plaintiff has standing if it is either the holder or the assignee of the underlying note at the time that the action is commenced (*see Aurora Loan Servs., LLC v Taylor*, 25 NY3d 355, *supra*; *Loancare v Firshing*, 130 AD3d 787, *supra*; *Emigrant Bank v Larizza*, 129 AD3d 904, 13 NYS3d 129 [2d Dept 2015]). "Either a written assignment of the underlying note or the physical delivery of it to the plaintiff prior to the commencement of the action is sufficient to transfer the obligation" (*see id.*, *Wells Fargo Bank, NA v Parker*, 125 AD3d 848, 5 NYS3d 130 [2d Dept 2015]; *U.S. Bank NA v Guy*, 125 AD3d 845, 5 NYS3d 116 [2d Dept 2015]).

Proof that the plaintiff was in possession of the note on a day certain or an "on or before" date (*see Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v Joseph*, –AD3d –, 2016 NY Slip Op 01661 [2d Dept 2016]) prior to the commencement of the action is sufficient to establish, prima facie, the plaintiff's possession of the requisite standing to prosecute its claims for foreclosure and sale (*see Aurora Loan Servs., LLC v Taylor*, 25 NY3d 355, *supra*; *Loancare v Firshing*, 130 AD3d 787, *supra*; *Emigrant Bank v Larizza*, 129 AD3d 904, *supra*). Alternatively, standing may be established by due proof of the particulars of the note delivery to the plaintiff prior to the commencement of the action (*see Deutsche Bank Natl. Trust v Weiss*, 133 AD3d 704, 21 NYS3d 126 [2d Dept 2015]; *HSBC Bank U.S.A., N.A. v Baptiste*, 128 AD3d 773, 10 NYS2d 255 [2d Dept 2015]; *cf.*, *Flagstar Bank v Anderson*, 129 AD3d 665, 12 NYS2d 118 [2d Dept 2015]; *Bank of Am., N.A. v Paulsen*, 125 AD3d 909, 6 NYS3d 68 [2d Dept 2015]). Delivery of the note to a custodial agent of the plaintiff on a date prior to the commencement of the action will suffice to establish the standing of a foreclosing plaintiff under the foregoing rule (*see Deutsche Bank Natl. Trust Co. v Whalen*, 107 AD3d 931, 969 NYS2d 82 [2d Dept 2013]; *HSBC Bank USA, Natl. Ass'n v Sage*, 112 AD3d 1126, 977 NYS2d 446 [3d Dept 2013]).

US Bank v Lepanto
Index No. 4431/09
Page 4

In addition, the plaintiff's attachment of a duly indorsed mortgage note to its complaint or to the certificate of merit required by CPLR 3012-b, coupled with an affidavit in which it alleges that it had possession of the note prior to commencement of the action, has been held to constitute due proof of the plaintiff's standing to prosecute its claim for foreclosure and sale (*see Nationstar Mtge., LLC v Catizone*, 127 AD3d 1151, 9 NYS3d 315 [2015]). Finally, the plaintiff may establish its standing by proof that it is the assignee of the subject note and mortgage under a written assignment of the note by the owner thereof at the time of the execution of the written assignment (*see Emigrant Bank v Larizza*, 129 AD3d 904, *supra*; *Peak Fin. Partners, Inc. v Brook*, 119 AD3d 539, 987 NYS2d 916 [2d Dept 2014]; *Chase Home Fin., LLC v Miciotta*, 101 AD3d 1307, 956 NYS2d 271 [3d Dept 2012]; *Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v Wine*, 90 AD3d 1216, 1217, 935 NYS2d 664 [3d Dept 2011]).

Here, the moving papers established the plaintiff's entitlement to summary judgment on its complaint to the extent it asserts claims against the answering defendants as it included copies of the mortgage, the unpaid note and due evidence of a default under the terms thereof (*see* CPLR 3212; RPAPL § 1321; *One West Bank, FSB v DiPilato*, 124 AD3d 735, 998 NYS2d 668 [2d Dept 2015]; *Deutsche Bank Natl. Trust Co. v Islar*, 122 AD3d 566, 996 NYS2d 130 [2d Dept 2014]; *Plaza Equities, LLC v Lamberti*, 118 AD3d 688, 986 NYS2d 843 [2d Dept 2014]; *Bank of New York v McCall*, 116 AD3d 993, 985 NYS2d 255 [2d Dept 2014]; *Jessabell Realty Corp. v Gonzalez* 117 AD3d 908, 985 NYS2d 897 [2d Dept 2014]; *Fairmont Capital, LLC v Laniado*, 116 AD3d 998, 985 NYS2d 254 [2d Dept 2014]; *W & H Equities LLC v Odums*, 113 AD3d 840, 978 NYS2d 910 [2d Dept 2014]). However, since plaintiff's standing was challenged in the Fourth affirmative defense in the answer of the mortgagor defendants, plaintiff's moving papers are insufficient to demonstrate plaintiff's possession of the mortgage note, which was indorsed in blank, before the commencement of this action. The moving papers fail to fully establish, *prima facie*, that the Fourth affirmative defense is without substantive merit.

While the affidavit of Ceedra D. Alle , dated January 22, 2014, satisfies the business records exception to the hearsay rule and is sufficiently detailed in all other respects, "she never states that the plaintiff was the holder of note at the time the action was commence (*see Deutsche Bank Natl. Trust Co. v Weiss*, 133 AD3d 704, – NYS3d – [2d Dept 2015]; *Deutsch Bank Natl Trust Co. v Idarecis*, 133 AD3d 702, – NYS3d – [2d Dept 2015]; *Wells Fargo Bank NA v Burke*, 125 AD3d 765, 5 NYS3d 107 [2d Dept 2015]).

It is to be noted that since the Court of Appeals holding in *Aurora Loan Servs., LLC v Taylor*, 25 NY3d 355, *supra*, which was issued after the making of this motion, courts have sustained standing where the plaintiff demonstrates holder or assignee status before the commencement of the action (*see Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v Joseph*, –AD3d –, 2016 NY Slip Op 01663 [2d Dept 2016]; *Wells Fargo Bank NA v Gallagher*, ___ AD3d ___, 2016 NY Slip Op 01661 [2d Dept 2016]; *Bank of New York Mellon v Visconti*, __ AD3d ___, 2016 WL 718277 [2d Dept 2016]).

It was thus incumbent upon answering defendants opposing the motion to submit proof sufficient to raise a genuine question of fact rebutting the plaintiff's prima facie showing or in support of the affirmative defenses and counter claims asserted in their answer or otherwise available to them (*see Jessabell Realty Corp. v Gonzalez* 117 AD3d 908, *supra*; *Flagstar Bank v Bellafigliore*, 94 AD3d 1044, 943 NYS2d 551 [2d Dept 2012]; *Grogg Assocs. v South Rd. Assocs.*, 74 AD3d 1021 907 NYS2d 22 [2d Dept 2010]; *Wells Fargo Bank v Karla*, 71 AD3d 1006, 896 NYS2d 681 [2d Dept 2010]; *J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, NA v Agnello*, 62 AD3d 662, 878 NYS2d 397 [2d Dept 2009]). Notably, self-serving and conclusory allegations do not raise issues of fact and do not require plaintiff to respond to alleged affirmative defenses and counter claims which are based on such allegations (*see Charter One Bank, FSB v Leone*, 45 AD3d 958, 845 NYS2d 513 [3d Dept 2007]; *Rosen Auto Leasing, Inc. v Jacobs*, 9 AD3d 798, 780 NYS2d 438 [3d Dept 2004]). Where a defendant fails to oppose some or all matters advanced on a motion for summary judgment, the facts as alleged in the movant's papers may be deemed admitted as 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 Enter., Inc. v Sokolowsky*, 101 AD3d 606, 957 NYS2d 88 [1st Dept 2012]; *Argent Mtge. Co., LLC v Mentessana*, 79 AD3d 1079, 915 NYS2d 591 [2d Dept 2010]). In addition, the failure to raise pleaded affirmative defenses or counter claims in opposition to a motion for summary judgment renders those defenses and counter claims abandoned and thus subject to dismissal (*see New York Commercial Bank v J. Realty F. Rockaway, Ltd.*, 108 AD3d 756, 969 NYS2d 796 [2d Dept 2013]; *Starkman v City of Long Beach*, 106 AD3d 1076, 965 NYS2d 609 [2d Dept 2013]).

Here, the opposing papers of the answering defendants only contain assertions that their pleaded standing defenses that is, the Fourth affirmative defense set forth in their answer, is not subject to dismissal because the plaintiff's proof did not establish that they are without merit as a matter of law.

Under these circumstances, the court awards the plaintiff partial summary judgment dismissing the affirmative defenses and counter claims asserted in the answer of the answering defendants except the Fourth affirmative defense asserted in the answer, as limited by this decision. The plaintiff's demands for summary judgment on its complaint is thus granted to the limited extent set forth above and its request for an order appointing a referee to compute amounts due is denied without prejudice, as such request is now premature.

Those portions of the instant motion wherein the plaintiff seeks an order dropping as party defendants, the unknown defendants listed in the caption and an amendment of the caption to reflect same are granted.

The moving papers further established the default in answering on the part of all defendants except the answering defendants, as none the remaining known defendants served answers to the plaintiff's complaint. Accordingly, the defaults of all such defendants are hereby fixed and

US Bank v Lepanto
Index No. 4431/09
Page 6

determined (*see U.S. Bank Natl. Ass'n v Wolnerman*, 135 AD3d 850, 2016 WL 229319 [2d Dept 2016]; *U.S. Bank, N.A. v Razon*, 115 AD3d 739, 740, 981 NYS2d 571 [2d Dept 2014]).

In view of the foregoing, and pursuant to CPLR 3212(g), the court hereby finds that the sole remaining issue of fact as to whether plaintiff is possessed of the requisite standing to prosecute its claims for foreclosure and sale is whether the plaintiff was either the holder of, or the assignee of, the underlying note when the action was commenced and that the trial of this action shall be limited to that issue.

Counsel are directed to appear ready to confer with the court on the readiness of this matter for the trial on the limited issue framed above at the conference scheduled herein for **March 29, 2016**.

DATED: 3/16/16



THOMAS F. WHELAN, J.S.C.