IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT 1 IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA 2 CASE NO. CACE13004386 3 4 CENTRAL MORTGAGE COMPANY, Plaintiff, 5 6 - VS -7 MARLENE V. RATTIGAN, 8 Defendant. 9 10 11 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 12 13 **BEFORE** THE HONORABLE JOHN J. MURPHY 14 15 16 **Broward County Courthouse** 17 201 Southeast 6th Street 18 Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301 19 20 21 22 January 8th, 2015 23 1:30-4:30 p.m. 24

j	
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	For the Plaintiff(s):
4	CURTIS HERBERT, ESQUIRE
5	Brock and Scott, PLLC
6	1501 Northwest 49th Street, Suite 200
7	Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309
8	954-618-6955
9	Curtis.herbert@brockandscott.com
10	
11	For the Defendant(s):
12	EVAN ROSEN, ESQUIRE
13	2028 Harrison Street, Suite 204
14	Hollywood, Florida 33020
15	754-400-5150
16	Erosen@evanmrosen.com
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1							
2	<u>Witness</u> :	<u>Direct</u>	Cross	Redirect	Recross		
3	NATALIE MCCLENDON						
4	BY MR. HERBERT:	7		63			
5	BY MR. ROSEN:		41				
6							
7							
8	<u>EXHIBIT INDEX</u>						
9	<u>Plaintiff</u>	<u>Descri</u>	ption		<u>Page</u>		
10	1	Note			23		
11	2	Mortgage			24		
12	3	Assignment	of Mortg	jage	24		
13	4	Payment His	tory		35		
14	5	Screen Shot	:		38		
15	6	Breach Lett	ers		39		
16	6	Power of At	torney		44		
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

# 1 THEREUPON: 2 3 Claim 4 5 6 7 8 9 appea 10 Honor

THE COURT: This is Central Mortgage Company Claims versus Rattigan.

MR. ROSEN: Correct.

THE COURT: Case Number 13-4386.

MR. ROSEN: Yes.

MR. HERBERT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you want to state your appearances, please?

MR. HERBERT: My name is Curtis Herbert, Your Honor, with Brock and Scott. I'm here on behalf of the plaintiff, Central Mortgage Company. I have my witness.

MS. MCCLENDON: Natalie McClendon with Central Mortgage Company, the witness for today.

MR. ROSEN: Evan Rosen on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Rattigan.

THE COURT: And are they here today? Are they coming?

MR. ROSEN: They are here through me, Judge, but they are not here.

THE COURT: Okay. And counsel, is everybody ready to proceed?

MR. HERBERT: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. ROSEN: Yes.

24

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: Okay. Are you going to give an opening statement or waive it?

MR. HERBERT: I have an opening statement.

THE COURT: Go right ahead.

MR. HERBERT: If it pleases the Court, Your Honor, this is a contested foreclosure action on real property that is in Broward County, Florida. It's located in Miramar, 17679 Southwest 54th Street.

On October 30th, 2006, the defendant, Marlene Rattigan, executed and delivered a promissory note in the amount of 650,000 to GL Financial Services, LLC.

She was the borrower, and GL Financial Services, LLC was the originating lender. On the same day, Marlene Rattigan and her husband executed and delivered a mortgage security for the note, which was recorded in the public records of Broward.

The complaint was filed on February 19th, 2013 by Central Mortgage Company as plaintiff. It was verified by Central Mortgage Company and attached as exhibits a copy of the original promissory note which we have here today which we'll surrender and introduce into evidence payable to GL Financial

Services which had endorsements on it.

There was an endorsement from GL Financial Services, LLC, the originating lender, to Flagstar Bank, FSB. Flagstar Bank, FSB then endorsed it to Flagstar Capital Markets Corporation, and Flagstar Capital Markets Corporation then endorsed it in blank.

The original promissory note and mortgage were in the possession of the plaintiff, Central Mortgage Company, and they have it in their possession today.

An assignment of mortgage was executed and reported in the public records of Broward County, Florida. It was executed on 12/6/2012 by MERS on behalf of GL Financial Services, LLC, to Central Mortgage Company, the plaintiff. The assignment of mortgage was executed and recorded prior to the filing of the complaint in February, 2013.

The defendant, the Rattigan s, filed an amended answer in affirmative defenses through their counsel. That was on or about June 7th, 2013. I believe there were five affirmative defenses.

The first three generally dealt with standing, and then there was a fourth affirmative defense

regarding conditions precedent, the breach letter, 1 and the fifth was entitled double recovery. 2 3 We're here today pursuant to the Court's trial 4 order to present the note and offer testimony as to the current amount due, the defaults and costs 5 6 associated with this action. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. Do you want to give a brief opening? 8 9 MR. ROSEN: No, Judge. We'll waive. 10 THE COURT: Call your first witness. 11 MR. HERBERT: I would like to call Natalie McClendon. 12 13 THE COURT: Ms. McClendon, do you want to come 14 up, please? 15 (Thereupon, the witness was duly sworn and 16 testifies as follows:) 17 THE COURT: You may proceed, counsel. 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. HERBERT: 20 Q. Ms. McClendon, by whom are you employed? 21 Α. Central Mortgage Company. 22 Q. And can you briefly describe to the Court your 23 job title and duties at Central Mortgage Company? 24 Α. Sure. Foreclosure supervisor in the 25 foreclosure department at Central Mortgage Company. Ι

oversee the entire foreclosure process in all 50 states
that we service. I sign the legal documents that are
presented in court for any of the foreclosures in those

I also attend hearings and trials associated with the foreclosure and monitor the foreclosure timelines with the investors.

- Q. And are you familiar with the books and records of Central Mortgage Company?
  - A. I am.

states.

- Q. At my request, did you specifically review documents associated would the note and mortgage that are the subject matter of this action?
  - A. I did.
- Q. And are the records that you reviewed for today the kind of records that are kept in the regular course of business activity of Central Mortgage Company?
  - A. They are.

MR. ROSEN: Objection, vague. Which records?

THE COURT: Sustained. Which records?

### BY MR. HERBERT:

Q. Are the records that I asked you to review in regards to the introduction today at trial, specifically the promissory note, the mortgage previously referenced, an assignment of mortgage that was given to Central

Mortgage Company, complete payment history on this particular loan, a screen shot from your computer system regarding the date that the loan was -- that the note and mortgage were delivered to the possession of Central Mortgage Company, the breach letters or cure letters at the mortgage requires for fulfillment of conditions precedent.

Are those types of records that I've just referenced the type of records that are kept in the regular business activity of Central Mortgage Company?

A. They are.

MR. ROSEN: Objection. Compound and leading.

THE COURT: Overruled.

### BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. Are the records you reviewed in the documents we just discussed and that we have today maintained at the dates identified on the documents?
  - A. They are.
- Q. Are the business records made by or from information transmitted by a person with knowledge?
  - A. They are.
- Q. Are the business records you reviewed -- is it the regular business practice of Central Mortgage Company to make and keep such records?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. I would like to ask you a few questions to get some more detail about what you do, essentially. How long have you been with the company?
  - A. Seven years.
  - Q. And what other positions, if any, have you held with the company?
  - A. I have always been in the foreclosure department. I started out as a foreclosure processor, processing the foreclosures, and then I moved from a team lead to a supervisor.
  - Q. Does the company service loans that are both in default and those that are not in default?
    - A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

21

22

- Q. How long has Central Mortgage Company been servicing this particular loan?
- 16 A. Since 2007 it was acquired.
- 17 Q. And who was the investor on this particular 18 loan?
  - A. Deutsche Bank is the particular investor.
  - Q. Is this the first loan that Central Mortgage Company has serviced on behalf of this particular investor?
    - A. No.
- Q. Has Central Mortgage Company had a

  long-standing business relationship with this investor

as servicer?

- A. We do.
- Q. Okay. Has Central Mortgage Company in the past onboarded or verified documents and data from this particular investor?
  - A. We have.

MR. ROSEN: Objection, relevance.

THE COURT: Overruled.

### BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. When loans are required, as you indicated, and boarded, what process takes place regarding a recently acquired loan?
- A. When we acquire assets, it goes through our onboarding department. They verify the mortgage, the payment history, the notes, any type of correspondence with the borrower.

We key the information into our system, verify that all payments have been made, everything is correct that we have that reflects the prior investor's books.

- Q. Okay. Does Central Mortgage Company verify the information received from a prior servicer or lender?
  - A. We do.
- Q. Is this system that you use in Central Mortgage Company that you used to verify onboard disk,

data, and documents, is it a reliable system? 1 Α. It is. 2 3 Is it a system that's commonly used by Q. servicers in the banking industry? 4 5 MR. ROSEN: Objection, leading. 6 THE COURT: Overruled. 7 THE WITNESS: It is. 8 BY MR. HERBERT: 9 Have you had an opportunity to review the loan Q. 10 that is the subject matter of this action? 11 Α. I have. 12 In your review of this loan, was it also boarded and verified according to the procedures at 13 14 Central Mortgage Company? 15 Α. Yes. 16 MR. ROSEN: Objection, hearsay. 17 THE COURT: Overruled. BY MR. HERBERT: 18 19 Q. Do you have all the access to all the records regarding this loan? 20 21 Α. I do. 22 Q. Okay. Are there policies and procedures in place at Central Mortgage Company regarding onboarding 23 24 and verifying loans that they acquire?

25

Α.

Yes.

- Q. Have you had any particular training at all regarding the policies and procedures that Central Mortgage Company utilizes in maintaining its business records?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Is this training that you've had continuous? Is it ongoing?
  - A. It's training that we have every year.
- Q. Okay. Have you ever visited the particular department in Central Mortgage Company that receives and catalogs payments received on loans?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. How is that department set up?
- A. We have a cashiering department at Central Mortgage Company. Also within my area of foreclosure, we have a separate payment department for payments that come in during trial or modifications.
- We have the safe room, a locked room where you have to have a badge to access. Payments come in through there. They are posted in that room. They are posted the same day as received or returned in cases where it needs to be returned.
  - Q. Have you seen the process taking place?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Have you ever personally been involved in that

process?

- A. I have.
- Q. Have you ever seen or visited the department at Central Mortgage Company that receives documents, loan documents from prior servicers or investors?
- A. Yes. We actually get our original documents prior to foreclosure within my department, and I oversee that position.
- Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the process that takes place when the documents are received?
  - A. I am.
- Q. Okay. For all the occasions that you were reviewing the same business records and platforms, I would ask -- well, what I would like to do is show you a number of documents and ask if you can identify them.

MR. HERBERT: For purposes of these documents, Your Honor, I've already -- counsel has already seen them. We have filed them as far as exhibits. He has no objections to two of the documents, which will be the first two that I seek to give to the witness, the promissory note and the mortgage.

THE COURT: Defense, is that correct?

MR. ROSEN: That's correct. We have a stipulation, the note and mortgage will come in on objection.

1 THE COURT: The note and mortgage? MR. ROSEN: 2 Correct. THE COURT: Okav. This is the note? 3 4 MR. HERBERT: That is the promissory note. 5 THE COURT: This says fixed adjustable rate 6 note. And the mortgage? 7 MR. HERBERT: Yes. Your Honor. THE COURT: Mark them, and they will be in 8 9 evidence as Plaintiff's 1 and 2, respectfully. 10 (Thereupon, the documents have been brought into evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 and 2.) 11 12 MR. HERBERT: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MR. HERBERT: 13 14 First, I would like to show you what has been Q. 15 marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 and ask you if you could 16 look at that and can you identify it? 17 Α. Yes. This is the original note. 18 MR. ROSEN: Judge, just objection. It's a 19 waste of time. We can let the document speak for 20 itself. 21 THE COURT: Agreed. 22 MR. HERBERT: Okay. Let me see if I have any 23 questions other than -- okay. Your Honor, the 24 court file should be here. 25 THE COURT: Yes, I have the court file.

# BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. I would like to show you -- this is the court file on this particular case. And I've turned the page over to the original verified complaint that was filed in this matter. Can you look at the Exhibit A to that complaint that was filed?
  - A. Okay.
- Q. Okay. And take a look at that Exhibit A and let me know if that is the same promissory note that we have introduced as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1.
  - MR. ROSEN: We'll stipulate that the original is the -- the copy attached to the complaint is a copy of what has been introduced into evidence as Plaintiff's 1.

MR. HERBERT: That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So there's no need to establish it.

MR. HERBERT: I have no further questions on the note. I have no questions on the mortgage, since it has been stipulated to.

### BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. I'm going to show you another document, and ask if you can identify that document.
  - MR. ROSEN: I'm sorry, what is this document?

    MR. HERBERT: I'm sorry. That's a copy of the

assignment of mortgage. I have copies for you.

MR. ROSEN: That's fine. I have the copies that you served me, I just want to know which one you were going onto. That's all.

# BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. Do you recognize that document?
- A. I do.
- Q. Okay. And what is that document?
- A. It's an assignment of mortgage, and it's an assignment of Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems as nominee for GL Financial Services, which is the original lender on the note to Central Mortgage Company.
- Q. Okay. And that assignment of mortgage, does it assign to Central Mortgage Company on its face the mortgage that we introduced as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2?

MR. ROSEN: Objection, reading from a document not in evidence. You're supposed to identify it.

# BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. Okay. Let me rephrase that. That document, is that a document that's kept in the business records of Central Mortgage Company?
  - A. It is.
- Q. Okay. Is that a document that you reviewed as part of your -- in preparation for your testimony today?
  - A. I did.

MR. HERBERT: Your Honor, I would like to mark 1 this as Plaintiff's ID 1. 2 THE COURT: You're asking to have it admitted 3 into evidence? 4 MR. HERBERT: Not admitted into evidence, just 5 marked as Exhibit 1 for identification. 6 THE COURT: Excuse me. Exhibit A for 7 identification is going to be the note. B is the 8 mortgage. And they are 1 and 2 respectfully, so 9 this would be item C for identification. 10 11 MR. HERBERT: Thank you. THE COURT: Not in evidence. 12 MR. HERBERT: Correct. 13 14 BY MR. HERBERT: 15 Q. Okay. The date of execution by MERS on that document, what is that date? 16 MR. ROSEN: Objection, leading. Reading from 17 18 a document not in evidence. 19 THE COURT: What is the date of the execution? 20 That's not -- I'll overrule the objection as to 21 leading. But reading from the document, she just 22 identified it, so I'm going to allow it. 23 Overruled. THE WITNESS: December 6th of 2012. 24 25 MR. HERBERT: Your Honor, I would ask that

5

this be introduced into evidence as part of the business records of Central Mortgage Company as Plaintiff's 3.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. ROSEN: Judge, this is not a self-authenticating documents. The witness has testified by reading from the title of it and I assume they are also seeking to admit it for the truth that the mortgage was assigned. That makes it hearsay.

Apparently, there has been an attempt -- my objection would also be hearsay and authentication. I can briefly voir dire on those issues, Judge, or we can save that for cross.

THE COURT: Well, I would respectfully request that you save it for cross. The reason is I know the witness testified that this document is kept in the ordinary course of their business, but this is also a record that appears to have been recorded in the public records of Broward County, Florida.

MR. ROSEN: Correct. And as far as it being recorded, if it was a certified copy of the recording, that would make it self -authenticate, and that would cover that issue, but it's not certified.

And this is our fifth time here for trial.

Plaintiff's counsel certainly could have run across the street and got it certified to come here.

That's probably what would be required, and I would imagine, has been from my experience when I'm trying a case.

Otherwise, it's not self-authenticating, and I can voir dire on that briefly now, or we can cover that on cross as far as hearsay is concerned.

THE COURT: Thank you. Yes?

MR. HERBERT: Your Honor, from the standpoint of qualifying, this really gets to the issue of whether or not she qualifies as a business records custodian, and the documents we're going to seek to introduce in evidence on behalf of Central Mortgage Company can come in under the business records exception to the hearsay rule.

Obviously, the first two are not objected to, but all the rest of the documents are documents that come directly from the records of Central Mortgage Company.

If he would like to voir dire the witness to see if she qualifies as a business records custodian for purpose s of being able to introduce those under the exception --

THE COURT: Counsel, you don't have to be a custodian to testify about the business records as long as she has knowledge. She indicated she has knowledge and she's familiar with it. She can testify to that.

MR. ROSEN: I have no objection from that standpoint. I don't plan to examine the witness on whether or not she's an underqualified witness for CMC records.

At this point, you've laid an adequate foundation, and I'm going to help move things along here and not get into a lengthy voir dire on this issue. She's apparently seen it, done it.

For CMC records, my position is that this

AOMis not a CMC record. In fact, it was not

prepared by or created by, and may very well have
been a copy maintained by.

But that's not -- that doesn't, in and of itself, make it a CMC record. So there would be some brief voir dire on that issue.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't know if you're entitled to voir dire on that issue. You're just simply objecting to it. I don't know that that cuts it, Counsel, respectfully.

Obviously, this is a business record of

Central Mortgage Company, as counsel indicated it wasn't prepared by them. It's a document from MERS as the nominee for GL Financial Services. It looks like it was returned to Central Mortgage Company.

All right. Objection is overruled. It will be admitted.

THE COURT CLERK: Plaintiff's 3.

(Thereupon, the document has been brought into evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit 3.)

### BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. The next document I would like to show you is the loan payment history. Can you take a look at that document, and I'll ask you if you can identify it.
- A. Yes. This is a payment history that's pulled off of our servicing system. It reflects all of the payments made and disbursements made from CMC.
- Q. And how is this payment history produced by Central Mortgage Company?
- A. It is printed from our servicing system and anything that comes in is changed. So payments coming in that day will reflect on the payment history, same with any disbursements we take out, such as insurance.
- Q. Okay. And that payment history department who puts that together and receives the disbursements, you previously have worked in that department?

- \_\_

- A. Actually, this is from our foreclosure department. Anybody can print a payment history that works with Central Mortgage Company.
- Q. Okay. And is the printout a history of all the payments and disbursements made upon the particular loan which is the subject matter of this foreclosure action?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Are the entries that are reflected on that payment history made contemporaneously with the payments received and the disbursements that are made?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So was the payment history printed out by you in preparation for this trial?
  - A. It was.
- Q. Was that history made at or near the time of the dates identified contemporaneously when payments were received and disbursements were made?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Is the record the kind of record that -- a payment history Central Mortgage Company regularly keeps in its business activity?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And is it made by a person with knowledge from information transmitted by that person?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And is it the regular practice of Central Mortgage Company to maintain and keep those records?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. What is the date of default that's reflected on that payment history, if you could take a look at that?
  - A. August, 2012.
  - Q. Okay. And is the loan still in default?
  - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Has the loan been brought current at any time since it went into default?
  - A. No.
- Q. Have funds been advanced by the plaintiff to protect insecure collateral in regards to this loan?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Have any payments been received by the borrower since the date of default reflected on that payment history?
  - A. No.
  - MR. HERBERT: Your Honor, I would like to offer this payment history into evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit 4, I believe.
    - THE COURT: Any objection?
    - MR. ROSEN: No objection, Your Honor.

BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. Was that particular screen shot retrieved by you from the system that Central Mortgage Company uses to maintain its records?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And was that screen shot -- the dates and the information on that screen shot that you've identified made contemporaneously?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And is the record the kind of record that's kept in the regular business activity of Central Mortgage Company?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And are the -- is the information and data on that screen shot made by a person from information transmitted, that person having knowledge?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Is it the regular practice of Central Mortgage Company to maintain and keep those types of records?
  - A. Yes.
  - MR. HERBERT: Okay. I would like to introduce that as Plaintiff's 5, Your Honor.
  - MR. ROSEN: No objection.
- 24 THE COURT: It will be admitted.
- 25 (Thereupon, the document has been brought into

evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 for 1 identification.) 2 MR. HERBERT: I just have a few other further 3 questions. 4 THE COURT: Whenever you are ready. 5 BY MR. HERBERT: 6 Is there a date reflected on that 7 Q. Okav. screen shot, that document that has been introduced into 8 evidence that shows the date of receipt of the original 9 10 promissory note and mortgage by Central Mortgage 11 Company? 12 Α. Yes. And what is that date? 13 Q. 14 November 7th of 2012. Α. 15 Q. Okay. And is that date prior to the date that 16 the complaint in this action was filed? 17 Α. Yes. Okay. I'm going to show you another document. 18 Q. 19 This is the breach letter. 20 MR. HERBERT: There's actually two breach 21 letters, Your Honor, one to Harold Rattigan, one to 22 Marlene. I can introduce them separately or as a 23 composite. 24 THE COURT: Can they come in together as a 25 composite?

MR. ROSEN: That's fine. And the mortgage is noticed to one, and that's paragraph 15 in the mortgage. That's fine.

And I can stipulate that that's coming in as a CMC record. You've laid an appropriate foundation in my opinion at this point.

MR. HERBERT: Okay. I want to admit this into evidence as Plaintiff's 6.

THE COURT: It will be admitted into evidence.

(Thereupon, the document has been brought into evidence as Plaintiff's Composite Exhibit 6.)

# BY MR. HERBERT:

Q. Okay. There are two breach letters that are a composite exhibit, Plaintiff's 6. Can you tell me who those breach letters have been sent to based on the address on the breach letter?

MR. ROSEN: Objection, hearsay as to whether or not they were sent. The date on the letter, I have no issue with, but as to whether or not they were sent --

### BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. Let me rephrase it. Can you give me the name of the addressee on those two letters which are Plaintiff's Exhibit 6?
  - A. Marlene Rattigan and Harold Rattigan.

And what is the address that's reflected on Q. 1 the breach letter? 2 17679 Southwest 54th Street, Miramar, Florida, 3 33029, the same address that's in default. 4 And are those the breach letters that Central 5 Mortgage Company sends out as part of the cure 6 provisions on the mortgage? 7 Objection, vague, speculative, 8 MR. ROSEN: relevance. 9 10 THE COURT: You can answer the question. THE WITNESS: 11 Yes. 12 BY MR. HERBERT: Are those letters generated by Central 13 Q. Mortgage Company? 14 15 Α. They are. 16 Q. Are you familiar with the process regarding 17 the preparation of those letters? I am. 18 Α. Is there a requirement regarding the 19 Q. 20 preparation and when those letters need to go out? 21 Α. Yes. 22 And what is that requirement? Q. 23 Sent out by our default support department, Α. which is connected to the foreclosure department, and 24 25 they are sent out -- depending on which state it is --

- some states require to be sent differently, but they are 1 sent out at least 30 days prior to the foreclosure 2 review. 3
  - Do those letters provide a notice of Q. Okay. default?
    - Α. Yes, they do.
  - Q. Okay. And does it give a timeframe on the letters for the borrowers or the addressee on those letters to cure the default?
    - Α. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- And what is the date of default that's on Q. those breach letters?
  - Α. The date of default is August 1st, 2012.
- Okay. And is that the same default date Q. that's reflected on the payment history, which has previously been introduced into evidence?
  - Α. Yes, sir.
- And -- actually, that's all the questions I have on the breach letter. This is the limited power of attorney. Can you look at that document and identify it for the Court, please?
- Α. Limited power of attorney for Deutsche Bank National Trust Company to Central Mortgage Company.
- 24 Q. And who is Deutsche Bank National Trust Company?

1 Α. Deutsche Bank is one of the investors for 2 Central Mortgage Company. 3 Q. And on this particular loan, is Deutsche Bank 4 National Trust Company the investor on this loan? 5 Α. They are. 6 Q. And you service this loan on behalf of 7 Deutsche Bank, the investor? We do. 8 Α. 9 Q. And that power of attorney, is that a recorded 10 document? 11 Α. Yes, sir, it is. 12 Q. Okay. Is it recorded in --13 Α. Broward County. 14 Q. Okay. And the purpose of that power of 15 attorney is what? 16 Α. So Central Mortgage Company can testify for 17 the records of --18 Objection, best evidence rule. MR. ROSEN: 19 We'll let the contents of the written document 20 speak for itself. 21 THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. HERBERT: 22 23 Q. Is that power of attorney the document that 24 evidences the right of Central Mortgage Company to

service this loan on behalf of the investor?

A. That's correct.

MR. HERBERT: Would you like me to go through the -- just for purposes of the business records exception, do you want me to go through the four prongs, or are you going to object to it coming in as a business record?

MR. ROSEN: No. Actually, that's fine. You can -- we'll stipulate that it's in.

THE COURT: This next document will be marked as Exhibit 7.

(Thereupon, the document has been brought into evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit 7.)

### BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. I'm going to show you another document and ask if you can identify what that is.
  - A. This is the final judgment.
- Q. Okay. Does that final judgment contain the figures that are due and payable on this loan, including the principal balance, interest, and any advances that were made?

### A. Yes.

MR. ROSEN: Judge, this is improper. This document is not going to be introduced into evidence. The witness is reading from a document not in evidence. This is a proposed final

judgment.

My position is that if the facts and evidence elicited and introduced in court support this document, then it should so be entered at that time.

But at this point, it's improper, and again, reading from a document not in evidence.

THE COURT: Counsel, my understanding is that she can refresh her recollection from anything.

So if she's refreshing her recollection, and it gives rise to her ability to recollect the numbers -- the outstanding balance, I would allow it.

But it has to be to refresh her recollection. She's not just going to read from it.

MR. HERBERT: I understand, Your Honor. I was actually going to use it for identification and allow her to refresh her recollection as to the figures, because she prepared that document.

MR. ROSEN: It still would be an improper refresh. She never had any personal knowledge of this. Her knowledge of this loan is based upon a review of documents.

The documents that are in evidence should either support the figures in the judgment or not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

She doesn't have personal knowledge.

I don't know if she does or not. THE COURT: At this juncture, the objection is overruled. Ma'am, is this something that would refresh your recollection?

THE WITNESS: Yes. All these figures are derived from the pay history.

THE COURT: Proceed.

# BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. Based on your review of the business records for Central Mortgage Company, the pay history that has already been introduced into evidence, did the records reflect the outstanding principal balance that was due on this particular loan?
  - Α. Yes.
- And if you could refresh your recollection as Q. to what the exact amount of the outstanding principal balance is?

Judge, again, improper refresh. MR. ROSEN: She never said she doesn't remember. She never said she had personal knowledge and forgot. furthermore, if the evidence supports the figures, then I'll have no objection to this, but to read from it and whether they are supported or not supported is an improper way to get in damage

figures that may or may not be supported by the evidence.

THE COURT: The objection is overruled.

BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. Do you recall what the unpaid principal balance is that's due on this loan?
  - A. \$760,323.46.
- Q. And is there interest that's due on this loan since the date of default through today?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you recall the amount of interest that's due on this loan from the date of default through today based on your review of the business records of Central Mortgage Company?
  - A. 56 --

MR. ROSEN: Objection, Judge. Reading from a document not in evidence. That document should be used to refresh. She should look up if her memory has been refreshed and then testify from her own knowledge.

THE COURT: Thank you. Objection is overruled.

# BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. I'm sorry. What was the amount again?
- A. \$56,553.06.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Were there any late charges that were due on this particular loan?
  - Yes.
- Do you recall the amount of the late charges that are due pre-acceleration late charges?
  - \$250.
- Do you know if there were any advances Okay. made for taxes on this particular loan, property taxes?
  - Yes. Taxes were advanced for three years.
- Do you know what years those taxes were related to, the advances?
- 2012 to 2014.
- Do you recall the amounts specifically -- the amount of those taxes for each individual year?
- Α. I can't remember all of them, but give me a If they are here, I can show them.
- Q. Would you be able to refresh your recollection by looking at the figures and determining that those are the figures that you recall were in the system?
- Α. Absolutely. That's correct. About \$7,500 each time.
- The hazard insurance, was there any hazard Q. insurance that was advanced by Central Mortgage Company?
  - Α. Yes.
  - And do you recall the amounts specifically Q.

that were advanced by Central Mortgage Company to pay the hazard and flood insurance on this particular home?

A. Hazard was around \$11,000. The flood insurance was about \$1,500.

MR. ROSEN: Objection. Again, reading from a document not in evidence. I just want to throw it out there, I'll stipulate if it's in the pay history, it can be in the judgment. Whatever there is fine by me if we get to that phase.

THE COURT: Thank you. Your objection is noted. Counsel, she has indicated it's around number. She's not giving you an exact number.

So I don't know if this document is refreshing her recollection or not as far as the taxes and the insurance. She said it's around \$7,500 in taxes.

MR. HERBERT: What I would like to do, Your Honor, with the --

MR. ROSEN: And the objection would also be speculation.

MR. HERBERT: If I could have the payment history?

THE COURT: Counsel, if you admit the document, I give it to the clerk, and when you want them back, I give them to the witness. All of them are still up here.

You're welcome to get any of them at any time, but when you are done with them, I request you come back just in case Mr. Rosen would want to look at it.

MR. HERBERT: Thank you, Judge.

MR. ROSEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

# BY MR. HERBERT:

- Q. This is the payment history which has been introduced into evidence. I wanted to ask you to look at the payment history which has been introduced into evidence, and if that can refresh your recollection as to the exact amount that was paid on real property taxes advanced by Central Mortgage Company on this property.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. Can you refresh your recollection by looking at it and saying on the record what those amounts are?
  - A. For 2012, it's \$7,594.36. For 2013 --

MR. ROSEN: Objection, Judge. Lack of personal knowledge, reading from a document not in evidence.

MR. HERBERT: The payment history is --

THE COURT: Objection overruled. It's in evidence.

MR. ROSEN: I apologize. To the extent that it's being prepared with the judgment.

1 THE WITNESS: \$7,586.32 for 2013. For 2014, 2 \$7,770.28. 3 BY MR. HERBERT: 4 And does the payment history also reflect 5 disbursements for insurance that was advanced by Central 6 Mortgage Company? 7 It does, flood and hazard insurance. Α. 8 Q. And can you look at that document and refresh 9 your recollection as to the exact amounts that were 10 disbursed for hazard and flood insurance? 11 Α. For 2013, flood insurance is \$1,064. For 2014 12 13 it's \$2,384, and for 2013, it's \$9,800.50.

- flood insurance, it's \$523. For 2014 hazard insurance,
- Were there any property inspection fees that were advanced by Central Mortgage Company?
  - Α. There were.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- And does that payment history refresh your Q. recollection as to the amount of property inspection fees our advances?
- Α. It does. They are individually listed. It's the total of \$307.
- Q. Were there any escrow credits that were due to the borrower as reflected on that payment history?
- Α. There is a starting escrow amount and there was an insurance refund. The full amount of both

of those would be \$11,219.81.

- Q. And just to refresh your recollection, because I think you had estimated what the amount was, the pre-acceleration late charges, does it reflect what that amount is and can it refresh your recollection by looking at the payment history as to the amount of pre-acceleration late charges?
  - A. \$253.44.

Α.

Q. Okay. What is the remedy you are asking of the Court today?

reasonableness of those fees and costs.

MR. HERBERT: Your Honor, there are fees and costs that were reflected on the proposed judgment.

Obviously, we've listed an expert witness as to the

To proceed with judgment and set a sale date.

I have affidavits which we have filed with the Court regarding attorney's fees and costs, reasonable attorney's fees and costs. It is not an expert witness.

We can bifurcate the issue of attorney's fees and costs for a hearing, if Mr. Rosen so wishes.

MR. ROSEN: Judge, attorney's fees were not pled. The fees were something that were maybe -- if they are something we can live with, like over a few thousand dollars, I don't want to waste the

Court's time.

But it is \$10,550 in fees. It's not in the wherefore clause, it's not pled, and therefore, it shouldn't be proffered at all. And any testimony to would be irrelevant.

THE COURT: So you're objecting to the affidavits?

MR. ROSEN: And I object to the affidavits, of course as not evidence.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.

MR. HERBERT: Okay. Your Honor, if I could have the court's file for a moment?

THE COURT: Here you go.

MR. HERBERT: Thank you. I have no further questions at this time.

THE COURT: Thank you. Counsel, do you have any questions?

MR. ROSEN: I do, Judge. Thank you.

#### CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. ROSEN: Permission to move freely about the courtroom, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes.

## BY MR. ROSEN:

Q. The note that has been marked into evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 shows a start date of October

1 | 30th, 2006, correct?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

12

13

14

20

21

22

- A. Correct.
- Q. And it shows that the first payment is due December 1, 2006, correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And the loan history with CMC, the first payment shows as April, 2007, correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. So there were payments -- you are not claiming there weren't payments before 2007, correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
  - Q. So there were payments between December, 2006 and April, 2007 not reflected on this, correct?
    - A. Correct.
- Q. I'm showing you what has been marked as
  Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, the mortgage, as well as
  Plaintiff's Exhibit 6, the default letter. First of
  all, your knowledge of this loan is based upon a review
  of records, correct?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. And you, yourself didn't mail that letter, correct?
- A. No, but my company did, and the area that's connected to my department did.
  - Q. And you don't have a record here with you, a

- document that shows it was actually sent, isn't that correct?
- A. I have a certified mail receipt that was signed by the borrowers.
  - Q. But those are not in evidence, right?
- A. No. I didn't bring them from the mail department.
  - Q. Let's take a look at the payment history.

MR. ROSEN: Judge, if I could, I want to hand you -- with counsel's permission -- a copy of the payments that were provided to me.

Or, you can rely on the one that's actually introduced into evidence. Let's do it that way.

Before we do that, Judge --

### BY MR. ROSEN:

- Q. This here is a copy of the payment history, and it says here that this was from Jada Steiner, an e-mail. That's what that says, right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And Jada Steiner works with the plaintiff's law firm, Brock and Scott, correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And she sent this pay history, and take a second to look through it. I just want you to make sure this is an accurate copy, because I'm going to be

talking to you about this copy, and just make sure it's the same copy as what you have here, if you don't mind.

MR. HERBERT: Before she answers, I would object based on the fact that this is a document which is not introduced into evidence.

He's talking about an e-mail from a law firm with an attached payment history which I have no basis to know if that's a complete copy, if that -- that hasn't been filed with the Court, as far as I know.

MR. ROSEN: That's why I'm asking the witness --

THE COURT: Counsel, I don't have a problem.

Why don't you -- please show it to counsel. My
understanding is, Counsel, he has notations on it.

Mr. Rosen has notations on it, and that's why he's trying to make sure it's the same as what you have. I don't know if there's anything other than that.

MR. ROSEN: Well, just so I can cross-examine on it, and I would like the Court to be looking at the same thing, if that's possible, as well. I will show it to you, and I apologize that I didn't do it first.

But as an officer of the Court, this is the

exact thing I received, and I'm hoping it's an exact copy of what has been introduced. I certainly relied that yours was, as well. Barring, of course, the markup that has been added to the document.

THE WITNESS: This is it.

MR. ROSEN: Great. Let me show your attorney.

Mr. Herbert? I should have thought to do this

before, Judge. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: No problem.

MR. HERBERT: It looks the same, Your Honor, and she's testified that our copy is the same. Is he going to be cross-examining based upon the payment history in evidence, then, since it's the same?

MR. ROSEN: I'm going to be handing the Court --

THE COURT: He wants to show it to me so I can follow along.

MR. ROSEN: I would like to publish it as the trier of fact here, if I could. Thank you, Judge. I'm handing the Court the one that has been marked in evidence, and I'm showing the one that has been testified to as a copy and has been shown to plaintiff's counsel.

BY MR. ROSEN:

Q. So I've highlighted and I've gone through, starting with the April '07 payment, and that was applied to May, the April 30th payment.

And I'm following through month by month, and just quickly, we have May '07, every payment made through December of '07, correct?

- A. Hold on.
- Q. Just take your time. I'm trying to do it as quickly as I can. I'm going through it chunks at a time. The payments are all there from April to the end of the year?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And again, from January of '08 to December of '08, each monthly payment is reflected on there, correct?
- 17 A. That's correct.
  - Q. January of '09, and I'm going to go forward all the way, to make it easy, 12/2010. We'll do a two year chunk of time at this point.
    - A. Okay.
  - Q. Now, drawing your attention to January of 2011, that payment was made, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And we have February of 2011, it shows the

regular payment on the bottom there, correct?

A. Uh-huh.

- Q. And then we have on the top of the next page -- so January and February of 2011 are made. We have a payment that looks like it came in on February 25th that was for a due date of March 1st, correct?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. And it shows unapplied payment, correct?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And over here, on the far right, it was put over in this unapplied amount column, correct?
- A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. And the same thing happened for the next payment, which was March 24th. Again, it was unapplied, and again, it was accounted for over in the second to the last column on the right side?
    - A. Correct.
  - Q. Then we have another one in April, another one in May, and in fact, it looks like two in May. Is that correct?
  - A. No. It's just one in May. See here the unapplied amount went up by 2,000.
- Q. But the total amount is different. Isn't that correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. Actually, they were regular payments, so those were not send to the unapplied, correct?
- A. These were -- let's see. The payment for February was sent to unapplied. The payment for March was sent to unapplied, which leads me to believe that this is under modification trial payments because the loan was modified in 2012.
  - Q. The loan was modified?
- A. It was modified, or it's going to be modified. Whenever we get modification payments in, they are posted into a suspense account until the modification is completed, and then they are posted to the account with the final mod documents.
- Q. And this loan has actually been modified, correct?
- A. According to my notes that I have written down in my folder here, this loan has been -- there's a modification.
- Q. Okay. Let's keep going on, then. So what would have been a March payment was unapplied, what would have been an April is unapplied, correct?
  - A. Let me look real quick. Okay.
- Q. And then we have a May also that -- excuse me.

  An April, which would have been a May payment that is
  also unapplied, correct?

1 A. Correct.

- Q. And then we have what would have been a June and July payment as regular payments. Those were received, correct?
- A. Correct, but they were posted. They weren't put in unapplied.
  - Q. They were posted, sure.
- A. They were posted for March, and they were posted for April.
- Q. Correct, but had -- that's fine. And what
  would have been next an August payment, because again,
  we're up through July, was a regular payment posted,
  correct?
  - A. Yes. This was posted for May, because there's still --
    - Q. Unapplied funds?
- 17 | A. Yes.
  - Q. And again, a September payment -- what would have been a September payment, what would have been an October payment were made in July and August, correct? And those were applied as regular payments?
    - A. As July and August.
  - Q. And going all the way down next would have been November -- what would have been in November was paid in September for a \$2,300 regular payment, correct?

1 A.

- Q. And then the next one, what would have been December was received in October, what would have been a January, 2012 was in November of 2011. Isn't that right?
  - A. Yes.

Correct.

- Q. And then a February, 2012 was -- what would have been a February, 2012 was received in December of 2011 and what would have been a March was received in January of 2012. Correct?
- A. You're months behind because of the money that was unapplied.
- Q. Sure. Exactly. And then April -- again, what would have been an April was received in February. What would have been a May was received in March, what would have been a June was received in April of 2012.
- 17 Correct?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. Then the next page, what would have been a July payment was received in May, what would have been an August payment was received in June, what would have been a September payment was received in July. Correct?
    - A. Correct.
  - Q. On the actual acceleration letter and in the complaint, it alleges that there had been a default for

the August 1st, 2012 payment. Isn't that correct?

A. Correct.

- Q. And yet there were a couple of payments that were put into unapplied, and you don't have a business record with you today that says Ms. Rattigan told you to put that in unapplied funds, do you?
  - A. No, I can't say I do.
- Q. And would there be such a record, or is that something CMC would do without input typically from the borrower for one reason or another? In this instance, there was a loan mod, apparently?

MR. HERBERT: Objection, speculation.

THE COURT: If she knows, she can answer.

THE WITNESS: We would do it without permission from the borrower, because we are required to do so per our servicing agreement with the investor.

#### BY MR. ROSEN:

- Q. Okay. So let's take a look at the letter.

  It's claiming -- it looks like -- is that \$7,325.40 is

  due?
  - A. It's \$7,325.40, correct.
- Q. And this letter is dated October 2nd, 2012.

  So that should include -- from what it says here, it

  look like it would include August, September, and

- October. Is that right? Three payments?
  - A. Correct, and any late charges.
- Q. Okay. And it also says here in the letter that the amount to cure -- it says in order to cure, you must pay so on and so forth under paragraph two. That's what it says there, right?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And it says that amount is subject to increase as additional monthly installments, interest, late charges, or other authorized expenses become due, correct?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. And it --
  - A. It says you have 30 days to cure it.
- Q. Sure. And it says on the bottom of paragraph three, you are strongly encouraged to call Central Mortgage Company or contact Central Mortgage Company about the total amount to cure prior to issuing payment. Isn't that what that says?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. So they have to contact Central Mortgage, Mr. and Mrs. Rattigan, to find out interests, late charges, or other authorized expenses. Is that right?
  - A. If there were additional ones on here, you know, if they sent it at a later date. But if they went

- ahead and sent in what was on the demand letter, we would still accept it.
  - Q. Okay. Let's take a look at the mortgage, paragraph 22. First of all, paragraph 22 is in all bold, correct? The whole paragraph?
    - A. Yes.

- Q. It's the only paragraph that's in all bold on the whole mortgage, correct?
- A. I would have to flip through it to give you an answer to that.
  - Q. Sure. Go ahead.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Just quickly, in paragraph 22, it starts off with the lender shall give notice to borrower. That's what that says, right?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And the next sentence says the notice shall specify. It starts with that, correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
  - Q. And one of the things it says it shall specify -- well, it goes through A, B, C, and D. And on D, it says that failure to cure the default on or before the date specified in the notice may result in acceleration of the sums secured by the security agreement, foreclosure by judicial proceedings, and sale

of the property. That's what that says, right?

A. Correct.

- Q. Yet nowhere in this letter are the words foreclosure by judicial proceeding. Isn't that correct?
- A. It talks about the foreclosure proceeding in the nonexistence of a default or other defense to acceleration and foreclose.
- Q. That says you have the right to assert in the foreclosure proceeding the nonexistence of a default or other defense to acceleration of foreclosure. That's what number six says, correct?
- A. Correct. And number four says your failure to cure the default on or before the date specified in the paragraph above may result in acceleration of the sums secured by the security interest in a foreclosure sale of your property as well as other remedies available to the lender.
- Q. So in any of those two sentences -- again, number six relates to a further sentence in paragraph 22, which is the notice shall further inform the borrower of the right to reinstate after acceleration and the right to assert in the foreclosure proceeding nonexistence of a default or any other defense of a borrower to acceleration and foreclosure. That's covered, that last sentence.

My question to you, and I believe you've answered it, was to point out where it says foreclosure by judicial proceeding as it relates to not paying by the date specified?

MR. HERBERT: Your Honor, I'm going to object. The documents speak for themselves. He's asking her to interpret whether or not the letter, the breach letter which has been introduced into evidence says or -- basically says foreclosure proceedings or the exact wording that's indicated in paragraph 22.

Paragraph 22 has been introduced into evidence, the breach letter has been introduced into evidence. The two documents that are in evidence speak for themselves as to what they say.

THE COURT: Counsel, this is cross-examination. It's liberal. Those are your documents in evidence, and he has a right to question the witness about them.

## BY MR. ROSEN:

- Q. Thank you, we'll move on. Just quickly, we talked in the pay history about the loan mod -- and that's in writing when there's a loan mod in this case, right?
  - A. Yes.

5

A. Yes.

Q. Let's talk about the power of attorney that has been received into evidence as -- I don't see the power of attorney. I'm showing you what has been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 7.

And let me grab, if I could -- if I could do the same, I would like to just show it to opposing counsel and make sure I have an accurate copy.

I would like to hand the Court the actual exhibit and cross-examine the witness with what should be a true and correct copy that was provided to me in the notice of filing exhibits. Just let me know that you stipulate that I can use this as an exact copy to cross-examine her with.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  HERBERT: This is the same document. BY MR. ROSEN:

Q. I'm handing back to the Court what has been introduced as Plaintiff's Exhibit 7 and showing the witness what has been stipulated to as a copy of that exhibit.

Let's take a look at this. It says that

Deutsche Bank National Trust Company and National

Banking Association organized existing etc. -- and then

it says pursuant to the pooling and servicing agreement,

correct?

1 2 3

- Q. And the pooling and servicing agreement is not in evidence, correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. And then it goes on to the bottom, and says for which Central Mortgage Company is acting as the servicer, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And it says here this appointment shall apply only to the following enumerated transactions, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And number eight says with respect to a mortgage or deed of trust, the foreclosure, the taking of a deed in lieu of foreclosure, or the completion of a judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure or termination, cancellation, or rescission of any such foreclosure including without limitation any and all of the following acts. That's what that says there in paragraph eight, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And then it goes on to say the substitution of the trustee in A, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. B, preparation and issuance of statements, etc. there?
  - A. Yes.

- •

- •

- Q. C, the preparation and filing of notices of default and/or notices of sale, correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. D, the cancellation/rescission of notices of default or notices of sale, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. E, the taking of deed in lieu of foreclosure, right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And then F, the preparation execution of such other documents and performances of such other actions as may be necessary under the terms of the mortgage, deed of trust, or law to expeditiously complete said transactions in paragraphs 8 A through 8 E above.
  - A. Yes.

That's what that says, right?

- Q. And then down at the bottom, it says undersigned gives that attorney in fact full power and authority to execute such instruments and due and perform all and every act necessary to -- and proffer to carry into effect the power or powers granted by or under this limited power of attorney. That's what that says, correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And then it says this appointment is to be

construed and interpreted as a limited power of attorney, correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. The enumeration of specific items, rights, acts, or powers herein is not intended to, nor does it give rise to, and is not to be construed as a general power of attorney, correct? That's what that says?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And then the last thing I want to go over on page four, the second to the top, first full paragraph there, this limited power of attorney is not intended to extend the powers granted to the servicer under the agreement or to allow the servicer to take any actions with respect to mortgages, deeds of trust, or mortgage notes not authorized by the agreement. That's what that says, right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And nowhere in here does it say CMC has the right to hold the note, correct?
- A. We have the right to enforce it as the servicer. I would have to read through the whole thing and see if we have the right to hold it. And it says with the completion of a judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure. So in order to proceed with any type of foreclosure, we need the note to proceed.

As far as the words CMC can hold the note, 0. 1 that's not in there, correct? 2 No. Α. 3 As far as the words CMC can enforce the note. 4 those words are not in there, correct? 5 MR. HERBERT: Objection, Your Honor. 6 answered that question. 7 THE COURT: Sustained. 8 9 BY MR. ROSEN: As far as CMC can foreclose the mortgage, 10 Q. those words are not in there, correct? 11 MR. HERBERT: Again, objection, Your Honor. 12 She's answered the question. 13 THE COURT: You've read that and have gone 14 15 through that. Move on, Counsel. 16 MR. ROSEN: Fair enough, Judge. Thank you. BY MR. ROSEN: 17 18 Where are the records kept in this case? The Q. 19 note, the mortgage, the original records, where are they 20 kept in this case? 21 When we received them? Α. 22 Just before trial, where were they kept? Q. 23 They should have been in the court file or Α. with our attorney's office. 24 25 Q. You're not sure though?

- A. Brock and Scott brought them here today.
- Q. But you don't know for sure who had them?
- A. They had them with the cover letter when it was sent to us.
- Q. You saw them in their office before you came here today?
- A. I did not personally see them in their office.

  I saw them in my attorney's hands.
- Q. Prior to filing the lawsuit, where was the note and mortgage kept?
  - A. Prior to filing the complaint?
  - Q. Yes.
- A. It was submitted to Brock and Scott prior to filing the complaint. When we received them, they are stored in our office in a fireproof safe until they are sent over to the attorneys.
- Q. Okay. So were they kept at CMC or at the law firm prior to lawsuit? Rather, on the day of the lawsuit. Let's make it easy.
- A. On the day of the complaint, it was with Brock and Scott.
- Q. You admitted into evidence through your counsel a screen shot that shows on 11/7/2012, which was a few months before the lawsuit -- I'm showing you what has been marked in evidence as Exhibit 5. It shows the

date and time as 11/7/2012, correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. And it shows that the custodian was Wells Fargo Bank, correct?
  - A. That's who we ordered them from, correct.
- Q. Let's take a look at the note one more time.

  Let's take a look at the final judgment of foreclosure

  that has been -- that you used to refresh your

  recollection, and we can take a look at the pay history,

  too.

So the pay history has been introduced as Plaintiff's Exhibit 4, and I'm showing you that along with Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, the note. And in the note, I want to turn your attention to paragraph 3 D in the note. It says limit on my unpaid principal. Correct?

- A. Yes.
- Q. My unpaid principal can never exceed a maximum amount equal to 115 percent of the principal amount I originally borrowed, correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And the original amount was \$650,000, correct?
- 22 A. Correct.
  - Q. Would a calculator assist you in conducting some math?
    - A. That would be great.

Okay. As far as you know, would this Q. 1 calculator on your phone help you conduct math 2 3 accurately? Α. Sure. 4 Okay. So let's say 650,000 times 1. --5 Q. rather, let's do that again. 650,000 times 1.15 equals 6 \$747,500, correct? 7 Correct. Α. 8 9 Q. And the amount on the judgment and the amount on the pay history for principal that's being sought is 10 11 \$760,323.46, correct? Α. Yes. 12 And that's because there's a loan 13 Q. 14 modification, correct? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Q. I have no further questions. 17 THE COURT: Any redirect? 18 MR. HERBERT: I have a brief redirect, Your 19 Honor. REDIRECT EXAMINATION 20 BY MR. HERBERT: 21 22 Q. You testified on cross-examination at the 23 payment history you have that Central Mortgage Company 24 produced starts I believe in April, 2007? 25 Α. Yes.

Okay. There were payments that were made 1 Q. prior to that date? 2 Yes, to the prior servicer. 3 Was that date prior to Central Mortgage Q. 4 Company onboarding the loan? 5 Α. Yes. 6 When Central Mortgage Company onboarded the 7 Q. loan, did Central Mortgage Company verify the principal 8 balance and the other figures and data that were given 10 to it? 11 Α. Yes. 12 MR. ROSEN: Objection, speculation. 13 THE COURT: Overruled. 14 THE WITNESS: Yes. That's part of the 15 onboarding process. 16 BY MR. HERBERT: 17 Q. So the figures that are on -- I guess April 18 1st, 2007, which is the first entry on the payment 19 history, those figures were verified by Central Mortgage 20 Company as part of its onboarding process? 21 Α. Yes, sir. 22 Same objection. MR. ROSEN: 23 THE COURT: Overruled. BY MR. HERBERT: 24

The breach letters. Okay.

On the breach

25

Q.

letter, counsel asked you questions regarding parag 22?

A. Yes.

- Q. And I would just like to go through A, B, C, and D in paragraph 22.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. It does indicate as counsel has stated that the notice shall specify the default. Is there anywhere on that breach letter that you can see in your review that it notifies the borrower of a default under this loan?
  - A. Yes.

MR. ROSEN: Objection, Judge. Legal conclusion. We already said the documents will speak for themselves, and I was cut off on that. We can just save that for argument as to whether legally it complies with the contract or not.

THE COURT: I would agree with that, Counsel.

MR. HERBERT: Well, these are the same

questions before that counsel on cross-examination got to ask as to what it says on the breach letter.

All I'm asking her is is there a notice to default on the breach letter.

THE COURT: The document can speak for itself and is in evidence.

# BY MR. HERBERT:

Q. Okay. The limited power of attorney. I would like you to take a look on page three of the limited power of attorney.

At the bottom -- near the bottom of the page, there's a paragraph that starts with the undersigned gives that attorney full power and authority to execute those instruments.

Can you read that paragraph regarding the powers that were enumerated and given to Central Mortgage Company as the servicer?

### A. Yes.

MR. ROSEN: Judge, it's the same. I was cut off on that.

THE COURT: You are allowed to pull from this document. I don't have a problem with that, but I've already read it. Counsel was going over it, and I had a copy of it, and I read along with it.

MR. HERBERT: Okay. Well, he referred to that paragraph. We'll talk about it at closing. I have no further questions.

MR. ROSEN: Judge, just a brief recross based on something that came up and now she's verified prior data that is not in CMC's records. I just want to briefly cross on that process, because that

was never testified to before.

THE COURT: She testified to the boarding process, Counsel. You can step down. There's no recross. Are you going to call any other witnesses?

MR. HERBERT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You rest?

MR. HERBERT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you calling any other witnesses?

MR. ROSEN: I have a motion for involuntary dismissal at the time the plaintiff rests.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. ROSEN: Judge, the motion for voluntary dismissal is the mechanism similar to a directed verdict in a jury trial in which the Court is asked to consider the evidence in a light most favorable to the nonmoving party as to whether or not they've established a prima facie case to establish foreclosure.

Prima facie elements of a foreclosure case are four prongs under the Ernest v Carter case, one, that there is a contract, two, that there is a breach, three, that there was a proper acceleration, and four, damages to satisfy the mind

of a prudent and impartial person of a definitive amount as to the contract.

Judge, you have unrefuted testimony that there was a written agreement that modified this loan that is not in evidence. It was not attached to the complaint, and it was not pled.

Under the best evidence rule, they are seeking to foreclose based upon a note which is not before the Court. It cannot be done. We have no idea what the terms are. That's exactly why we have the best evidence rule.

That contract should be before the Court so we can see exactly what was said and what wasn't said, what was required and what wasn't required in order to determine if there was, in fact, a breach.

As to the acceleration, we have no evidence admittedly before this Court that the letter was sent. We have testimony that it sent every time. Under the Alexander v Allstate case -- I just want to give the Court a copy of that -- testimony that something is done is a business practice.

Without saying it was done here and without knowledge it was done here is hearsay. Let me hand the Court and opposing counsel a copy of that case, as well. She didn't do it here.

The only way she would know it was here is because there's a business record that said it was done, and there's no business record that shows it was done. All she can testify to is generally this is what we do. And that's not enough pursuant to paragraph 15.

As to the default, the letter itself specifies that the default and the complaint is supposed to say there's a default as of August 1st, 2012. But as you saw, and we walked the witness through this on the pay history, payments were made through August, through September, through October.

On their own, Central Mortgage Company without any indication or interest or intent offered or demanded decided to not apply payments, to put them in an unapplied category.

At some point, she was then paying in advance, months ahead. And there was no testimony, again, or business record again that she was instructed to do so, nor that this was permitted.

And I would hate to get cheeky here with the Court. Part of me -- it is what it is from when I did jury trials. CMC in this instance -- the plaintiff wants it to stand for Central Mortgage Company, but to me, it stands for creating mortgage

chaos.

MR. HERBERT: Your Honor --

MR. ROSEN: They took two payments, misapplied them, creating a default. Meanwhile, she's ahead paying all the way through October, and then sent a letter in October saying you're in default. She even paid October. They just put it in the wrong category.

As to the action required to cure, the borrower is not to be placed in the position of detective. I have case law on that if the Court would like to see it with regards to conditions precedent.

In the letter and on cross-examination, it was admitted that in order to find out what they needed to do to cure, they have to contact Central Mortgage Company.

Paragraph 15 says it has to be in writing what's needed to be done, and paragraph 22 is very, very clear what needs to be done. Let's talk about overall paragraph 22 in just one second and why it's so important that the letter be correct and accurate.

And before I get to that, there's just one other thing that's missing, and those are the words

foreclosure by judicial proceeding. That if you fail to cure, those words are not mentioned at all. We know the word shall in the law has very specific meaning.

Paragraph 22 says the letter shall in all bold. The letter shall give notice to borrower.

Paragraph 15 defines giving notice at mail. Again, we don't have that.

Then, we get onto the next sentence. The notice shall specify. Specify, according to the Supreme Court of Florida, has a very, very unique meaning on top of shall, and I would like to hand the Court a case on that. It's a Florida League of Cities case, a Florida Supreme Court from 1992.

I highlighted a section which defines the word shall -- I'm sorry, the word specify. It's on page three, Judge. Thank you. Specify, according to the Florida Supreme Court, means to mention specifically, to state in full and explicit terms, to point out, to tell or state precisely or in detail, to particularize or to distinguish by words one thing from another.

Specify means a statement explicit detail and specifics of a misunderstanding is impossible. And here, what do we have? We have a letter that is

not particularizing the default properly, not particularizing what needs to be done to cure, nor particularizing the words foreclosure by judicial proceeding.

There's a Samaroo case, Judge, that came out a number of months back which addresses the substantial compliance issue. In that case, the appellate court said that substantial compliance is an argument we cannot credit. I'll hand the Court a copy of that.

The rehearing was denied in May of 2014. That letter did not mention the right to reinstate.

That Gabriel case did not mention the right to reinstate or the right to assert a defense.

Similarly, as here, words were just left out.

And I'll hand the Court Gabriel, as well.

It's a short opinion. I'm handing opposing counsel the case, as well. There's also a Judy case where the letter did not specify the breach.

It just said generally, you're in default.

I'm not making that argument here factually, but again, more law that shows examples of what specify and shall are and how those are to be interpreted.

The Destabo case, there's a great quote I want to read to the Court, and that is the importance of

a conditions precedent. And in Destabo, the 2nd District held that the mortgage is right to the security for a -- a mortgage is dependent on its compliance with the terms of the mortgage contract.

It cannot foreclose until it has proven compliance. Here's a copy of the Destabo case for the Court. Thank you. The Sheriff of Orange County versus Bolty case states that a specific denial of a general allegation of the performance or occurrence or conditions precedent shifts the burden to the plaintiff to prove the allegations of the subject matter of the specific denial.

We've done that. We all know the basic interpretation. I'm not going to waste the Court's time on handing the Court cases on how contracts are to be construed.

They are construed in accordance with their plain language as bargained for by the parties. I know from another case, Security First Federal SNL v Garjin, parties are bound by their contract no matter how inconvenient it turns out to be. Excelsior Insurance versus Ponoma Park Bar and Package Store, every provision of a contract should be given its full meeting and effect.

And Florida Recycling versus Greater Orlando,

**5** 

can't interpret a contract if it's unambiguous.

And we all know the well settled principals that if a contract has an ambiguity -- which this doesn't, but even if it did, it would be construed against the nondrafting party, which is certainly Mr. and Mrs. Rattigan.

They did not draft this mortgage contract.

Judge, briefly as to one last item, and that deals with -- two last items that deal with damages. And that is one, that there is a gap.

And if I was allowed to recross, which certainly the Court was well within its discretion not to allow that, I would have asked about this process of checking things that are not even in their system.

When boarding is discussed, normally, it's always about other records from another servicer that are reviewed. Well, here, there's no other records from another servicer, it's just a missing gap. So I didn't ask those questions.

In fact, I stipulated, because CMC's records -- there's nothing in there that's boarded. It's all their stuff. They serviced from April, 2007 forward. I would have asked about analyzing the defendant's bank statements, their canceled

checks, tax receipts, insurance bills, etc., to really know how do you verify something other than mathematically?

But here, there's nothing to verify. The document just wasn't there from December, 2006 to April, 2007. And lastly, as to the amount of damages.

In this contract, this note, there's a provision that the principal balance cannot exceed \$747,500. It cannot exceed it. They are asking you, Judge, to enforce a provision of a contract basically in breach of their own contract.

And why does it exceed? We know now because there's admittedly a loan modification, which brought me to the first point. But since that loan modification is not in evidence, we can't analyze the terms, the breach, the remedies, or anything else.

And lastly -- this is just for really understanding the severity of this. If there is a loan mod and there are advances made over and above the principal balance, as there apparently were here -- again, we don't have it in evidence -- but as there apparently were here, excise taxes have to be paid on that document or according to the State

of Florida and according to the statute and how the case law interprets it, that document is void.

So we have a document that's not here which may or may not be recorded, which may or may not have had excise taxes paid.

And just to understand the severity of what all this means, Judge, I just want to show you the excise tax statute briefly, even though we really -- arguably, but the Court can tell me otherwise -- really don't need to go there, because we don't have the written agreement.

But I think it's important to know how important it is that one, it be in writing. I'm sure the Court understands that from evidentiary and best evidence, but also the statute on excise taxes, which is Florida statute 201.8.

I'm handing opposing counsel a copy of that.

I'm handing the Court a copy of that, as well. And it's under subsection 1 B. And it's highlighted towards the middle of the paragraph.

The mortgage -- if the mortgage, trust, security, or other evidence and indebtedness subject to the tax levied by this section secures future advances, the tax shall be paid at the time or recreation of the initial debt or obligation is

cured, excluding future advances, and any time so often as future advances paid, the tax should be paid regardless of whether such advances were made.

Then, to proceed, at the very end, the mortgage, trust, deed, or other instrument shall not be enforceable -- this is the end of 1 B -- shall not be enforceable in any court of the state as to any such advance unless until tax due thereon on each advance that may have been made thereunder has been paid.

So we're dealing with the modification agreement. It's not before the Court. No evidence of taxes were paid, and I have case law that's crystal clear on this issue, but I don't know if we need to go there, Judge. You tell me otherwise.

Just to summarize, we have a contract -- an alleged contract that we don't have before us, an alleged breach that we don't know the terms of to determine, improper acceleration by the terms of their own document, and we have damages that are missing from their pay history, and impossible to know what the damages should be, because we don't have the right agreement.

And lastly, even if we did have the right agreement, there's a breach because they are asking

for more money than is allowed under their own agreement.

So for those reasons, we feel the plaintiff has not proved their burden to foreclose and the motion should be granted.

THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, sir?

MR. HERBERT: Your Honor, a couple points were raised by opposing counsel, first dealing with the more recent one. The statute 201.08 deals with future advances.

Future advances are essentially new money, additional money that are loans of the borrower, not additions to principal, which arise out of interest, other advances for taxes, insurance, etc. It's not new money.

It even says in the statute, itself, notwithstanding the aforestated general rule, any increase in the amount of original indebtedness caused by interest accruing under an adjustable rate note, can which is what this note is, having an initial interest rate adjustment interval not less than six months shall be taxable as a future advance only to the extent such increase is computable sum certain when the document is executed.

The interest rate adjustments are six months on this note. The statute doesn't apply based on the terms of the note, itself, and it also doesn't apply because again, the taxes that they are talking about in 201.08 are for future advances, not for additions to a principal based on advances for security, collateral, taxes and insurance, or interest.

So that argument, you know -- and I'm familiar with that argument. There are cases, and obviously you can't enforce the note if you don't pay taxes, but this mortgage was recorded, and the documentary stamps were paid at the time.

Regarding the breach, I'm familiar with the Samaroo case. If the Court looks at Samaroo, it does say that the real reason that the Court in Samaroo reversed is they found in the breach letter that the lender had, they did not inform or put anywhere in the breach letter that Samaroo had the right to reinstate after acceleration. It wasn't there, period.

There is a more recent case which deals with breach letters, and it deals with conditions precedent. I have a copy of that I can show Your Honor. This is the Buskets case. This case is out

of the 2014.

of the 2nd District. It was decided on March 21st, 2014.

And in that case, it talked about the same issue, whether or not a breach letter was compliant, and it talked about substantial compliance.

In the case that's being cited by counsel,
Samaroo, there was no compliance, whatsoever. They
didn't stand for the proposition that you had to
have strict compliance, they stood for the
proposition that they didn't even substantially
comply with it.

In the breach letter which is in evidence, all of the indications in paragraph 22 of the mortgage, A, B, C, and D are in there. The only thing counsel has said is it didn't say the right of a foreclosure proceeding.

But it did, in fact, say in the breach letter -- and I don't know if the exhibits are still available? Thank you, Your Honor. It did say in the breach letter a failure to cure on or before the date specified may result in acceleration and a foreclosure sale of your property and other remedies available to the lender.

It also said you have the right to assert a foreclosure proceeding, the existence of default, or any defense. Those are the exact issues that were present in Buskets.

It was a Mark Stober case, who was counsel on behalf of the borrower, and they examined those same type of deficiencies, and indicated that the breach letter, as it is with the Central Mortgage Company breach letter, was substantially compliant, and it informed the borrower of their rights in the foreclosure proceeding.

So our position is that the breach letter was a proper notification of default and acceleration of the debt when they filed the foreclosure action.

In addition, the witness did testify regarding the payment history. She testified when the default date was. The default dates matched both the complaint, the payment history, and the breach letters. They were all the same.

The amount that she testified to were the amounts that she got from her system, and those amounts were correct.

There is no evidence today other than the fact on cross-examination where he asked her to point out payments, etc., that changed the analysis that

she testified the default date was in August of 2012, and that they sent out the breach letter for that amount, indicated the amount necessary to reinstate on that date within 30 days.

As a result of them not reinstated, then they filed the foreclosure action. I don't think that the involuntary dismissal motion is well placed.

I believe there was sufficient evidence that the plaintiff carried their case and gave sufficient evidence to the Court in order to prove not only the default, but the conditions precedent were complied with, and that they are entitled to a foreclosure judgment.

I will say in their answer in affirmative defenses, again, the only issues they raised as an affirmative defense is the issues of standish and conditions precedent.

None of the other issues were raised as an affirmative defense, and therefore, they are waived. From the breach of the default date and the conditions precedent, we've proved that the breach letter was sent out.

She testified as to the normal course for a breach letter to be sent out, and that's sufficient. It doesn't have to be acknowledged as

1 being received.

There's a case also talking about whether or not a breach letter has to be received or merely has to be sent. That's Roman versus Wells Fargo, and it was decided on August 1st, 2014, 5th District Court of Appeal, and at the bottom, it indicated pursuant to the terms of the mortgage, a notice is deemed to have been given to the borrower and mailed by First Class Mail.

Nothing in the mortgage requires the borrower -- the plaintiffs to actually receive the notice -- receive notice for the notice to have been given.

She testified that's the practice of Central Mortgage Company. She worked in that department, she has personal knowledge of it that that's the policy of the company, and it's business records are that the notice goes out within 24 hours of the date the letter is prepared.

So we don't believe that under the affirmative defenses raised in their amended answer either standing or breach, conditions precedent, that they have a well-founded motion for involuntary dismissal. I believe it should be denied, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anything else, Counsel?

MR. ROSEN: Thank you, Judge. Just briefly. We don't know what caused the increase in the payments.

There has been no evidence of that, whether tax, insurance, increase principal, because we're missing the contract. That wasn't addressed at all in plaintiff's response. Not at all.

They are suing on a contract that's not before this Court, and it wasn't responded to in our motion. That alone should be grounds to grant the motion. Substantial compliance words were never mentioned in Buskets. They used the words in that letter foreclosure proceedings.

The Court thought that was close enough to judicial proceedings, but foreclosure proceedings were not part of that phraseology at all by the letter here. There's no mention, whatsoever, about payments that were being paid in advance.

In July, there were payments being made for October. And again, this idea, this created mortgage chaos where she's paying in advance, and payments are not being applied, no discussion of that.

We pled and -- or rather, they pled that my client signed the note and mortgage. That's attached to this complaint. We admitted that.

But that had nothing to do with coming into court on another agreement that's not before us.

And Judge, for that reason alone, the Court should grant the motion for involuntary dismissal.

THE COURT: Thank you. Counsel, I haven't read any of your cases. I will. Both sides have given me cases. I'll read them, so I'll defer ruling, take it under advisement. Are you going to call any witnesses?

MR. ROSEN: I am not, Judge.

THE COURT: So defense rests?

MR. ROSEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Is there any additional argument?

MR. HERBERT: No, Your Honor. Just that the motion should be denied, and we ask that judgment be entered.

I have additional cases regarding standing and other issues, but he has not indicated at all that those are the grounds for the dismissal. He did say that the breach letter -- I do have one case, and I would like to share it with Your Honor if you're going to consider them. There's a recent

case that came out yesterday.

THE COURT: Really?

MR. HERBERT: This is the one that I like.

MR. ROSEN: Calloway?

MR. HERBERT: Yes. He did make the argument regarding the proposition about current servicer and prior servicer's rights and prior investors, and whether or not they were records of CMC, even though there were four months that were missing at the very beginning, can be introduced into evidence, and if they are acceptable.

I believe that case covers the issue regarding those first four months when it started in April of 2007.

MR. HERBERT: It wasn't four months if I'm not mistaken. Maybe it was five months. The first payment reflected was as per May.

I think it was five months, but not meaning to split hairs. But regardless, that's not the crux of our argument. We admitted the CMC records in.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, do you have anything else from the other side?

MR. ROSEN: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you. I'll read the cases and take it under advisement. Do you have your

1 proposed judgment? 2 MR. HERBERT: Yes, Your Honor. And I have --3 if you granted involuntary dismissal, I have a form 4 that I grabbed. MR. ROSEN: Thank you, Judge. Anything we can 5 6 do to help you with the decision, memorandums or 7 anything like that? THE COURT: 8 No, sir. 9 MR. ROSEN: Thank you. I won't take too long. You should 10 THE COURT: 11 have one tomorrow. Thank you so much. 12 MR. ROSEN: Great. 13 THE COURT: We're adjourned. 14 (Thereupon, the hearing has been concluded.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

## CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF BROWARD I, FABIOLA JAMES, a Court Reporter in and for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did report the proceedings in the above-styled cause before the Honorable JOHN J. MURPHY, at the time and place set forth; that the foregoing pages, numbered from 1 through 87, inclusive, constitute a true and complete record of my notes. I further certify that I am not an attorney or counsel of any of the parties, not related to any of the parties, nor financially interested in the actions. Dated this 13th day of January, 2015.