

1
2 **POSTED ON WEBSITE**
3 **NOT FOR PUBLICATION**
4

5 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
6 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
7 **MODESTO DIVISION**
8

9 In re) Case No. 10-91936-E-7
10)
11 WALTER RALPH PINEDA,)
12)
13 Debtor(s).)
14)
15 WALTER RALPH PINEDA,) Adv. Pro. No. 10-9060
16) Docket Control No. TMT-2
17 Plaintiff(s),)
18 v.)
19)
20 BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., et)
21 al.,)
22)
23 Defendant(s).)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

29 **This memorandum decision is not approved for publication and may**
30 **not be cited except when relevant under the doctrine of law of the**
31 **case or the rules of claim preclusion or issue preclusion.**

32 **MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER**

33 In response to the complaint in this adversary proceeding,
34 Defendants filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim
35 pursuant to Rule 12(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and Rule
36 7012, Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.¹
37
38

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162

1 of America, N.A. subsidiary, Bank of America Corp. LP ("BAC") is
2 alleged to be asserting rights as the servicer for the Note.

3 It is alleged that the Plaintiff had a long standing banking
4 relationship with Bank of America, N.A. dating back to 1972. This
5 bankruptcy relationship included the purchase and improvement of
6 his residence and for a second residence on the Bennett Road
7 Property. Plaintiff alleges that he achieved a "preferred
8 customer" status with Bank of America, N.A., and believed that Bank
9 of America, N.A. established a fiduciary relationship with the
10 Plaintiff. FAC ¶ 7.

11 The Plaintiff then suffered a serious illness which required
12 extensive hospitalization. This medical condition prevented
13 Plaintiff from meeting his financial obligations, and he requested
14 a loan modification from Bank of America, N.A.. FAC ¶ 8.

15 In 2008 Plaintiff submitted a request for a home loan
16 modification through the Home Affordability Program ("HAMP").
17 After one year without an answer to the HAMP application, Plaintiff
18 filed a complaint with the Comptroller of the Currency. Plaintiff
19 alleges that Bank of America, N.A. denied ever receiving a HAMP
20 application, denied that Plaintiff wanted to stay in his home, and
21 represented to the Office of the Comptroller that the Note was not
22 sold and that the investor in the Note was Bank of New York Mellon,
23 N.A. ("BNYM"). FAC ¶ 8.

24 The FAC contains an extensive discussion of the business
25 operations of Goldman Sachs, Inc. ("GS") in the selling of
26 interests in securitized loan portfolios,² that other courts have

27
28 ^{2/} The court uses the term "securitized loan portfolio" to
identify the business practices of assembling a large number of

1 required the securitized loan portfolio process to be strictly
2 followed for the notes in such portfolios to be enforced, and that
3 the "owner" of the promissory note evidencing the debt had the
4 right to enforce the obligation through foreclosure. The
5 allegations include reference to Bank of America, N.A. staying
6 foreclosures while it addressed the issue of "Robo Signing"³ of
7 foreclosure documents without verification of the facts. The
8 allegations in the FAC include reference to the Securities and
9 Exchange Commission initiating an investigation of financial
10 institutions, including Bank of America, N.A. and GS.

11 The FAC also includes a allegation that Bank of America, N.A.
12 would retain "possession" of a Note after it was being included in
13 securitized loan portfolio. Plaintiff assert that such practice
14 violates unidentified provisions of the Securities Exchange Act,
15 California Civil Code § 2739,⁴ Section 3-203 of the Uniform
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 home loans into a trust or other entity and then selling
23 fractional beneficial interest in the trust or other entity to
investors.

24 ^{3/} "Robo Signing" is commonly identified as a process
25 relating to judicial foreclosures where verified pleadings and
26 declarations were executed and filed with the courts when the
persons providing the verification or testimony had no knowledge
of the facts stated therein.

27 ^{4/} From reviewing the Opposition, it appears that this
28 reference is a misstatement, and the Plaintiff intends to refer
to California Civil Code § 2934a governing substitutions of
trustees under deeds of trust.

1 Commercial Code,⁵ and Business and Professions Code § 17200.⁶ It
2 is asserted that the violation of these provisions affests the
3 validity of the Note retained by Bank of America, N.A. as a secured
4 instrument.

5 **COUNT I - FRAUD**

6 Plaintiff asserts that Bank of America, N.A., GS, Goldman
7 Sachs Mortgage Securities Corporation ("GSSC"), and BNYM failed to
8 provide Plaintiff with an accounting of monthly payments from
9 September 2003 through August 2006. It is alleged that the
10 payments were diverted to other accounts in GSR 2003-9, which
11 deprived Plaintiff of the reduction of the amount due on the Note.
12 Further, Bank of America BAC, GS, and GSSC refuse to disclose other
13 amounts received through credit default swaps.

14 Plaintiff alleges that GS acted as an investment banker to
15 solicit investors, and that the funds were used to make loans,
16 including the monies borrowed by Plaintiff for the obligation
17 evidenced by the Note. After the loan was made to Plaintiff, his
18 account⁷ to GS for inclusion in a securitized loan portfolio, with
19 Bank of America, N.A. retaining possession of the Note. FAC ¶¶ 23
20 and 24. Plaintiff further alleges that Bank of America, N.A. and
21 GS entered into a Pooling and Securitization Agreement ("PSA") by

22
23 ⁵/ California has adopted its version of the Commercial,
24 with Division 3, Section 3302 defining a "holder in due course."
25 This provision does not govern the general enforceability of
instruments. See California Commercial Code §§ 3301, 3305, 3306,
3309 and 3312.

26 ⁶/ California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et. seq.
27 is an act which provides rights and remedies for an unlawful,
unfair or fraudulent business act or practice.

28 ⁷/ Plaintiff uses the term "account" without providing any
definition or description as to what is meant by that term.

1 which Bank of America, N.A. would obtain loans to be placed in a
2 securitized loan portfolio. Plaintiff alleges that GS would then
3 pay Bank of America, N.A. unidentified "kickbacks" for providing
4 adjustable rate loans for inclusion in the portfolio. On
5 information and belief Plaintiff alleges that Bank of America, N.A.
6 received excessive origination fees of \$4,526.00 and \$2,326.50 for
7 hazardous insurance paid by Plaintiff as the "kickbacks." It is
8 alleged that these amounts violated the Real Estate Settlement
9 Procedures Act ("RESPA"), specifically identifying Section 6
10 thereof. FAC ¶¶ 26 and 27.

11 Plaintiff further asserts that it was not disclosed
12 Plaintiff's monthly payments were credited to other accounts known
13 as "senior tranches" from September 2002 through 2008. This
14 conduct is asserted to violate the Truth in Lending Act (TILA),
15 without reference to a specific provision, and RESPA, specifically
16 identifying Section 6.

17 Plaintiff alleges that his note and deed of trust identify
18 Bank of America, N.A. as the lender and beneficiary. He contends
19 that this is not accurate, as the loans were originated for use in
20 the securitized loan portfolio. Since the Note was to be used for
21 securitized loan portfolio, Plaintiff asserts the use of his name,
22 signature (presumably on the Note and deed of trust), and
23 creditworthiness violated TILA, RESPA, California Civil Code 1709,⁸
24 and Business and Professions Code § 17200. FAC ¶¶ 30 and 31.

25 Plaintiff asserts that under a Sales and Servicing Agreement
26 between GS and Bank of America, N.A. grants "recourse" to GS in the

27
28 ⁸/ California Civil Code § 1709 is the codification of the
traditional tort of fraud.

1 event that there is a delinquency in loan payments. Further, under
2 the PSA Bank of America, N.A. has an obligation to make advances
3 for delinquent payments on the loans.

4 Plaintiff alleges that GS did not comply with the requirements
5 of the PSA to assign all right, title and interest into GSR 2003-9.
6 Because of that, his loan was not transferred into GSR 2003-9 and
7 GSSC was not entitled to receive Plaintiff's payments from 2002
8 through 2008. Further, Bank of America, N.A. did not deliver the
9 Note to GS as required by Uniform Commercial Code §§ 9-9313-9314.⁹
10 FAC ¶¶ 39-42.

11 Plaintiff's FAC asserts that the monies generated by the
12 payments on the loans in GSR 2003-9 were further sold. The failure
13 to disclose that others had purchased the right to these monies is
14 alleged to TILA, 15 U.S.C. § 1600 et. seq.,¹⁰ and California
15 Business and Professions §§ 17200 et. seq.

16 In October of 2009, Plaintiff alleges that he was notified by
17 Bank of America, N.A. that BAC would commence servicing the loan.
18 It is alleged that on January 21, 2010, the Plaintiff made demand
19 on Bank of America, N.A. for verification of the obligation owing
20 on the Note pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1692g¹¹ and RESPA. Plaintiff
21 asserts that he received what was identified as a partial
22

23 ⁹/ California Commercial Code §§ 9313 and 9314 relate to a
24 person taking a security interest in personal property and the
25 perfection of that security interest by taking possession or
control of the collateral.

26 ¹⁰/ This appears to be an incorrect citation. Presumably
27 Plaintiff is referencing § 1601 et. seq., the Truth in Lending
Act.

28 ¹¹/ This reference is to the Federal Fair Debt Collection
Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 et. seq.

1 accounting for the period January 2006 - August 2008. It is
2 alleged that the accounting was incomplete because it did not
3 include payments made by third-parties.

4 In January 2010, Plaintiff received a notice of default under
5 the deed of trust, which was recorded by ReconTrust. A
6 substitution of trustee under the deed of trust and an assignment
7 of the deed of trust were recorded on February 16, 2010. Plaintiff
8 did not receive notice of either the assignment of the deed of
9 trust (to GRS 2003-9) or substitution of trustee.

10 Plaintiff alleges that the recording the assignment of the
11 deed of trust to GRS 2003-9 was for the purpose "of conversion of
12 Plaintiff's approximate \$300,000 investment towards the purchase
13 and improvements" in the Bennett Road Property. This recording of
14 the assignment of the deed of trust is alleged to violate
15 California Civil Code § 1709 (Fraud). The alleged fraud is Bank of
16 America, N.A. misrepresenting to the County Recorder the Bank's
17 status as beneficiary under the Note. It is contended that Bank of
18 America, N.A. knew this was a misrepresentation, intended to induce
19 Plaintiff into believing that Bank of America, N.A. was the
20 beneficiary, Plaintiff relied on the misrepresentation and make
21 payments to GSR 2003-9, which had no right to receive payments. It
22 is asserted that the damages consist of the lack of reduction on
23 the Note obligation and the millions of dollars received by GSSC
24 from third-parties by "shorting" the GSR 2003-9 certificates.

25 Plaintiff contends that the 2003 "assignment" to GS
26 (presumably this references the Note)"extinguished" all of Bank of
27 America, N.A.'s contractual rights. Further, this 2010 assignment
28 of deed of trust will subject Plaintiff to "double financial

1 jeopardy" through claims of numerous and unknown bona fide
2 purchasers. It is also alleged that the substitution of trustee
3 was backdated by Bank of America, N.A. to match the January 22,
4 2010 assignment and notice of default.

5 Count I continues through paragraph 98 of the Complaint
6 repeating the allegations of fraud and misconduct with the transfer
7 of the Note and Deed of Trust after the loan with Plaintiff was
8 closed. The Plaintiff also contests whether BNYM is the trustee of
9 GSR 2003-9. Plaintiff alleges that is part of the fraud on
10 Plaintiff and investors in GSR 2003-9.

11 **COUNT II - BREACH OF CONTRACT**

12 Plaintiff asserts that the Deed of Trust contains specific
13 requirements for the power of sale, transfer services (Paragraph
14 20), accounting for third-party payments (Paragraph 11), and
15 procedures for the substitution of a trustee (Paragraph 24). It is
16 contended that Bank of America, N.A. breached this contract by
17 instructing ReconTrust to file a notice of default which states
18 that Bank of America, N.A. is the "present beneficiary" under the
19 Deed of Trust and ReconTrust is the Bank's agent. This breach was
20 done to convert the \$300,000.00 which Plaintiff has invested in the
21 Bennet Road Property.

22 It is further contended that Bank of America, N.A. and BAC
23 further violated the contract by failing to inform the Plaintiff of
24 transferring servicing to BAC. Additionally, the contract was
25 breached by Bank of America, N.A. failing to account for "third
26 party payments in 'excess' of the security interest in an attempt
27 to cover the millions of dollars Defendant [Bank of America, N.A.]
28 and Defendant GSSC received by third party payments including

1 credit default swaps." FAC ¶ 104.

2 Plaintiff asserts that he has been damaged because Bank of
3 America, N.A.'s and GSSC conduct resulted in a "60% loss in
4 property value and the highest rate of unemployment since the Great
5 Depression." Plaintiff also believes he is entitled to punitive
6 damages because Bank of America, N.A.'s breach of contract also
7 breached the covenant of good faith. Further, the violations of
8 RESPA and TILA give rise to defense and recoupment or \$220,000 of
9 loan payments made by Plaintiff.

10 **COUNT III - UNJUST ENRICHMENT**

11 Because GSSC received the monthly payments on the Note from
12 August 2003 through August 2008 illegally it has been unjustly
13 enriched. Further, GSSC's conduct in "shorting" GSR 2003-9
14 tranches "resulted in millions of dollars of profits and [unjust
15 enrichment] as a result of fraud and deceit perpetrated on
16 Plaintiff and the investors of [SGR 2003-9] trust."

17 **COUNT IV - DECLARATORY RELIEF**

18 Plaintiff seeks a declaration of the respective rights of the
19 Plaintiff, Bank of America, N.A., SG, GSSC, BNY, and ReconTrust in
20 the Note and Deed of Trust. The correct party who owns the Note
21 and has the right to foreclose under the Deed of Trust must be
22 determined.

23 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

24 By this FAC, the Plaintiff seeks a determination that the
25 obligation owing on the Note is dischargeable in this bankruptcy
26 case. Further, a determination that GSR 2003-9 unlawfully received
27 the mortgage payments for the period from August 2002 through
28 August 2008, and that Plaintiff is entitled to recover those

1 payments. Further, that the lien held by GSR 2003-9 is void and
2 unenforceable. Additionally, that GSSC, GS, and all other
3 Defendants be ordered to pay all ill gotten gain to Plaintiff and
4 investors who were deceived. Further monetary damages of
5 \$300,000.00 for general damages, \$400,000.00 in special damages,
6 and an unstated amount of punitive damages. Plaintiff wants a
7 judgment for an accounting fo all monies paid by Plaintiff and
8 others, including from credit default swaps. Finally, a
9 determination that the substitution of trustee and notice of
10 default were invalid.

11 **RULING ON MOTION TO DISMISS**

12 All of the Defendants have joined in filing a Motion to
13 Dismiss. The Motion pleads with particularity 12 ground for the
14 dismissal of the FAC. These grounds will be addressed in the order
15 stated in the Motion, with the court's ruling on each ground.

16 In considering a motion to dismiss, the court starts with the
17 basic premise that the law favors disputes being decided on their
18 merits, and a complaint should not be dismissed unless it appears
19 beyond doubt that the Plaintiff-Debtor can prove no set of facts in
20 support of his claim which would entitle him to the relief.
21 *Williams v. Gorton*, 529 F.2d 668, 672 (9th Cir. 1976). Any doubt
22 with respect to whether a motion to dismiss will be granted should
23 be resolved in favor of the plaintiff. *Pond v. Gen. Electric Co.*,
24 256 F.2d 824, 826-27 (9th Cir. 1958). For purposes of determining
25 the propriety of a dismissal before trial, allegations in the
26 complaint are taken as true. *Kossick v. United Fruit Co.*, 365 U.S.
27 731, 732 (1961).

28 The complaint must provide more than labels and conclusions,

1 or a formulaic recitation of a cause of action; it must plead
2 factual allegations sufficient to raise more than a speculative
3 right to relief. *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555
4 (2007). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, made applicable to this
5 adversary proceeding by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7008,
6 requires that complaints contain a short, plain statement of the
7 claim showing entitlement to relief and a demand for the relief
8 requested. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). As the Court held in *Bell*
9 *Atlantic*, the pleading standard under Rule 8 does not require
10 "detailed factual allegations," but it does demand more than an
11 unadorned accusation or conclusion of a cause of action. *Bell*
12 *Atlantic*, 550 U.S. at 555.

13 To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain
14 sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a
15 claim to relief that is plausible on its face. A claim
16 has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual
content that allows the court to draw the reasonable
inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct
alleged.

17 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. ___, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949, 173 L. Ed.
18 2d 868, 884 (2009) (citations and quotation marks omitted). Rule 8
19 also requires that allegations be "simple, concise, and direct."
20 Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)(1).

21 In ruling on a 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss, the Court may
22 consider "allegations contained in the pleadings, exhibits attached
23 to the complaint, and matters properly subject to judicial notice."
24 *Swartz v. KPMG LLP*, 476 F.3d 756, 763 (9th Cir. 2007). The court
25 need not accept unreasonable inferences or conclusory deductions of
26 fact cast in the form of factual allegations. *Sprewell v. Golden*
27 *State Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988 (9th Cir. 2001). Nor is the
28 court required to "accept legal conclusions cast in the form of

1 factual allegations if those conclusions cannot be reasonably drawn
2 from the facts alleged." *Clegg v. Cult Awareness Network*, 18 F.3d
3 752, 754-55 (9th Cir. 1994).

4 Though the court takes into account that the Plaintiff is
5 electing to represent himself and gives him leeway with respect to
6 his pleadings and use of legal terminology, the court cannot
7 attempt to construct his arguments or allegations. The court will
8 also not presume allegations omitted are "facts" in the Plaintiff's
9 favor.

10 In reviewing the FAC, the court first notes that it suffers
11 from an inconsistent duality. While a party may plead inconsistent
12 theories, the FAC suffers from inconsistent facts. A portion of
13 the FAC is premised on Bank of America, N.A. having all of its
14 rights extinguished by the transfer of the Note. Other allegations
15 are that Bank of America, N.A. never effectively transferred the
16 Note. In part of the FAC improper acts have occurred because the
17 Note was in a securitized loan portfolio, which in other parts
18 there was no transfer to the portfolio.¹²

19 The Plaintiff, as evidenced in the prayer, also appears to
20

21 ^{12/} In the zeal of filing a complaint, plaintiffs often feel
22 compelled to plead and state everything they can think of in
23 arguing their case. The complaint is the document in which the
24 plaintiff pleads plausible claims, not the time to try and prove
25 his case. If the Plaintiff decides that filing an amended
26 complaint is appropriate, he may well wish to focus his
27 allegations on his rights, his claims, and conduct of the
28 defendants against the plaintiff and his rights. From what the
court understands from the FAC now before it, the Plaintiff
borrowed money from Bank of America, N.A. and provided Bank of
America, N.A. with a deed of trust to secure the repayment of the
monies. Plaintiff was not the purchaser of negotiable
instruments from Bank of America, N.A., an investor in any trust
set into which were transferred Bank of America, N.A. promissory
notes, or engaged in any default swap transactions.

1 have fallen into the illogical trap that he is entitled to a second
2 residence for free because of what third-parties did with, and to,
3 each other. With limited exception, all of the conduct of the
4 Defendants complained about arose after the Plaintiff obtained the
5 monies he wanted from Bank of America, N.A. through the loan.
6 Though the Plaintiff received everything he was entitled to receive
7 from the loan (the money), Plaintiff believes that because of
8 subsequent financial transaction involving the Note (a negotiable
9 instrument which is freely transferable under the Commercial Codes
10 enacted by the States) were entered into by Bank of America, N.A.
11 and others, any obligation of Plaintiff on the Note were
12 extinguished. The FAC does not allege any claims or grounds by
13 which the Note, the negotiable instrument, has been destroyed.¹³

14 The court also notes that the FAC also suffers from a common
15 drafting trap of if more can be said, then it must be significant.
16 This leads to the FAC not making allegations about the Defendant,
17 but the financial community in general. The FAC contains extensive
18 references to Senate Finance Committee investigations, "Burger King
19 Kids," charges of misrepresentations to investors in securitized
20 loan portfolios, and "Robo Signers." What the Plaintiff misses in
21 including all of these broad discussions and allegations is the
22 specifics of what was done to this plaintiff.

23 Though sought in the prayer, Plaintiff does not assert a claim
24 or allege grounds by which the Deed of Trust, an interest in

26 ¹³/ The Plaintiff has not provided the court with any legal
27 authority for the proposition that post-loan business
28 transactions between Bank of America, N.A. and third-parties for
the transfer and negotiation of the Note renders the Plaintiff's
obligation to pay the Note invalid or unenforceable.

1 property, has been destroyed. Property rights are not lightly
2 treated under the law, and such rights are not easily destroyed.
3 In California, the security is not severed from the underlying
4 obligation merely by the transfer of the note. "The note and the
5 mortgage are inseparable; the former as essential, the later as an
6 incident. An assignment of the note carries the mortgage with it,
7 while an assignment of the latter alone is a nullity." *Carpenter v.*
8 *Longan*, 83 U.S. 271, 274 (1872); accord *Henley v. Hotaling*, 41 Cal.
9 22, 28 (1871); *Seidell v. Tuxedo Land Co.*, 216 Cal. 165, 170
10 (1932); Cal. Civ. Code §2936. Therefore, if one party receives the
11 note and another receives the deed of trust, the holder of the note
12 prevails regardless of the order in which the interests were
13 transferred. *Adler v. Sargent*, 109 Cal. 42, 49-50 (1895).

14 Conspicuously missing from the FAC are any allegations that
15 the Plaintiff has made all payments due on the Note and no default
16 exists. Rather, from the allegations in the FAC, the court infers
17 that due to the Plaintiff's illness he fell into default on the
18 Note and sought the HAMP restructure. The Plaintiff's inability to
19 have income to pay the monthly amounts due on the Note were
20 exacerbated by the fall in real estate values, precluding him from
21 refinancing the loan. Not an uncommon story.

22 The FAC contains extensive discussion of relating to the
23 investment in mortgage portfolios and various financial
24 transactions, including "default swaps." The Plaintiff contends
25 that the financial transaction that Bank of America, N.A. and
26 others entered into with the Note inure to the Plaintiff's benefit.
27 The Plaintiff offers no allegations as to how or why, after he has
28 received everything he is entitled to (the loan proceeds) for the

1 Note (negotiable instrument) he gave to Bank of America, N.A., the
2 Plaintiff is entitled to a passive participation in the financial
3 transaction involving the negotiable instrument.

4 The FAC also contains an interesting contention that lenders
5 cause a 60% drop in the value of the Plaintiff's property. Some
6 contend that real estate values were artificially inflated, and
7 that an "irrational exuberance" existed concerning the ever
8 increasing real estate sales prices. The run-up in real estate
9 prices in the first half of the 2000's is reminiscent of the rapid
10 increase in real estate sales prices in the 1980's, fuel by the
11 Savings and Loan lending practices. The seemingly never ending
12 increase in real estate prices came crashing down in the early
13 1990's, leaving many home owners with mortgages significantly in
14 excess of the price that a willing seller would pay once the
15 freewheeling lending practices ceased.

16 **STANDING**

17 The Defendants first attack the FAC on the basic issue of
18 standing. Standing is a Constitutional standard which requires
19 there to be an actual case or controversy between the parties.

20 Article III of the Constitution confines federal courts
21 to decisions of "Cases" or "Controversies." Standing to
22 sue or defend is an aspect of the case-or-controversy
23 requirement. (Citations omitted.) To qualify as a party
24 with standing to litigate, a person must show, first and
25 foremost, "an invasion of a legally protected interest"
that is "concrete and particularized" and "actual or
imminent." (Citations omitted.)...Standing to defend on
appeal in the place of an original defendant, no less
than standing to sue, demands that the litigant possess
'a direct state in the outcome.' (Citations omitted.)

26 Arizonans for Official English v. Arizona, 520 U.S. 43, 64, 117
27 S.Ct. 1055 (1997).

28 Defendants assert that when the Plaintiff filed this Chapter 7

1 case the Bankruptcy Code created the bankruptcy estate which
2 includes all of the claims at issue in this Adversary Proceeding.
3 11 U.S.C. § 541(a). In a Chapter 7 case, the Chapter 7 Trustee
4 alone has the ability to sue on behalf of the bankruptcy estate.
5 *Estate of Spirtos v. One San Bernardino County Superior Court Case*
6 *Numbered SPR 02211 (In re Estate of Spirtos)*, 443 F.3d 1172, 1176
7 (9th Cir. 2006); 11 U.S.C. § 323(b). As one court stated,

8 [A]ny unliquidated lawsuits initiated by a debtor
9 prepetition (or that could have been initiated by the
10 debtor prepetition) become part of the bankruptcy estate
11 subject to the sole direction and control of the trustee,
unless exempted or abandoned or otherwise revested in the
debtor. The debtor lacks standing in a chapter 7 case to
prosecute claims that are property of the estate.

12 *In re Bailey*, 306 B.R. 391, 392-93 (Bankr. D.D.C. 2004) (citations
13 omitted).

14 The Plaintiff responds that he communicated with the Chapter
15 7 Trustee at the First Meeting of Creditors. The Plaintiff asserts
16 that the Chapter 7 Trustee believes that Plaintiff can assert the
17 claims in this case. In the file for the Chapter 7 case, the
18 Trustee has filed a Report of No Distribution. Dckt. 28, filed on
19 August 21, 2010. However, the Plaintiff did not file an Amended
20 Schedule B listing this claim as an assert until November 30, 2010.
21 Dckt. 33. The Trustee has taken no action since November 30, 2010,
22 to modify the Report of No Distribution. Additionally, the
23 Plaintiff disclosed the existence of these claim on the original
24 Schedule C (though the basis for the exemption was not stated)
25 filed in this case, which predated the Report of No Distribution by
26 two and one-half months.

27 In his Amended Schedule C Plaintiff exempted the claims
28 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 703.140(b)(11)(d).

1 (See Schedule C, No. 10-91936 Dckt. 16; Amended Schedule B and C,
2 No. 10-91936 Dckt. 33.) While an exemption does not remove the
3 asset from the bankruptcy estate, the Plaintiff has rights in these
4 claims. The Plaintiff must address with the Trustee whether all of
5 the claims will be abandoned by the Trustee or if there is a
6 litigation agreement for the Plaintiff to prosecute the entire
7 action.

8 Further, Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(a)(3) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7017
9 provides for a real party in interest to substitute into a case,
10 ratify, or join an action. This includes a debtor obtaining either
11 the participation or authorization of the trustee to prosecute the
12 action, or an abandonment of the rights that are the subject of the
13 action. The court notes that the Debtor has not taken any action,
14 as reflected on the court's docket, to obtain either an abandonment
15 of these rights from the trustee or the joinder of the trustee in
16 this adversary proceeding. While not fatally defective at this
17 juncture, it is an indication that this adversary proceeding will
18 not be properly prosecuted and likely be dismissed if the matter is
19 not promptly addressed by the Debtor.

20 The Motion to Dismiss for lack of standing is denied without
21 prejudice.

22 **EXTINGUISHMENT OF RIGHTS IN BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.**

23 A significant contention in the FAC is that the transfer of
24 the Note to GSR 2003-9 extinguished all rights of Bank of America,
25 N.A.. The Plaintiff's opposition does not state how the transfer
26 terminated such rights, though the court interprets the argument to
27 be that Bank of America, N.A. "transferred" its rights as payee.
28 However, that does not mean that Bank of America, N.A. does not

1 have any rights. In this case, Bank of America, N.A. states in the
2 Points and Authorities to the Motion that it is alleged by
3 Plaintiff that Bank of America, N.A. continues to have rights by
4 virtue of the PSA, in which Bank of America, N.A. identifies as the
5 servicer of the loan. The court does not determine what rights the
6 Bank may or may not have in the context of the present motion.
7 Rather, the court determines whether this Plaintiff has been able
8 to state a plausible claim.

9 Exhibit 8 to the Complaint is a copy of the substitution of
10 trustee and assignment of deed of trust dated January 22, 2010,
11 which was recorded on February 9, 2010. This document states that
12 Bank of America, N.A., the original payee and beneficiary, is
13 identified as the "beneficiary" as the servicer for GSR 2003-9.
14 The deed of trust follows the note, and if the Note has been
15 transferred to GSR 2003-9 (legally, it would be transferred to the
16 trustee for GSR 2003-9), then GSR 2003-9 has the beneficial
17 interest in the deed of trust. Arguably, the Substitution of
18 Trustee and Assignment of Deed of Trust does not precisely name the
19 parties, it is consistent with the asserted transaction. GSR 2003-
20 9 can elect to act through agents, such as a loan servicer, to take
21 actions such as foreclosures. See *Baisa v. Indymac Fed. Bank*, No
22 CIV-09-1464 WBS JMR, 2009 WL 3756682, *3 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2009)
23 ("MERS had the right to assign its beneficial interest to a third
24 party"); *Weingartner v. Chase Home Finance, LLC*, 702 F. Supp. 2d
25 1276, 1280 (D. Nev. 2010), "Courts often hold that MERS does not
26 have standing as a beneficiary because it is not one, regardless of
27 what a deed of trust says, but that it *does have standing as an*
28 *agent of the beneficiary* where it is the nominee of the lender (who

1 is the 'true' beneficiary." Emphasis added.

2 As stated above, the Plaintiff has taken alternative factual
3 allegations as to Bank of America, N.A. having transferred the
4 note, not transferred the note, and transferred the note but
5 continued to service the Note through its subsidiary BAC Home Loans
6 Servicing, LP. Exhibit 7, April 21, 2010 letter by Plaintiff to
7 Bank of New York Mellon. But see Paragraph 55 of the FAC alleging
8 that all of Bank of America, N.A.'s contractual rights have been
9 "extinguished."

10 The Plaintiff fails to state a plausible claim that Bank of
11 America, N.A. has no right to enforce the deed of trust which
12 secures the Note. The possibility that the monies owed on the Note
13 to be paid for by the collateral (the Bennett Road Property) may go
14 to the principal of the Bank (GSR 2003-9) does not preclude Bank of
15 America, N.A. from fulfilling obligations as the servicer.

16
17 **FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH THE SALE OF THE
RESIDENCE (WRONGFUL FORECLOSURE)**

18 A plaintiff cannot challenge a foreclosure proceeding (whether
19 it is pending or has already occurred) without first credibly
20 alleging tender. *Karlsen v. American Savings and Loan Assoc.*,
21 15 Cal. App. 3d 112, 117-18 (1971); *FPCI RE-HAB 01 v. E & G*
22 *Investments, Ltd.*, 207 Cal. App. 3d 1018, 1021 (1989). A valid and
23 viable offer of tender means that it is made in good faith, the
24 party making the tender has the ability to perform, and the tender
25 is unconditional. See MILLER & STARR, CALIFORNIA REAL ESTATE,
26 §§ 1493-1495 (3d ed. 1989). A failure to allege such tender makes
27 the claim deficient on its face. *Alicea v. GE Money Bank*, 2009 WL
28 2136969 (N.D. Cal. 2009). However, the requirement of tender may

1 be waived. *Standley v. KNAPB*, 113 Cal.App. 91, 102 (1031);
2 *Humboldt sav. Bank v. McCleverty*, 161 Cal. 285, 291 (1911); and
3 MILLER & STARR, CALIFORNIA REAL ESTATE, § 10:212 (3d ed.)

4 The FAC is clear on its face that there has been and is no
5 tender being made to cure any the default in the payments due on
6 the Note. The Plaintiff instead has attempted to obtain a
7 modification of the Note, and is looking to have part of the debt
8 forgiven, reducing the amount to be paid to the present value of
9 the property. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants never
10 considered his loan modification, and lied to the Comptroller of
11 Currency about his loan modification request. Proposing a loan
12 modification (and promising to pay based on receiving a
13 modification) is not the same thing as promising to pay what is
14 actually owed on the note.

15 But as discussed in the following section on fraud in general,
16 the Plaintiff does not allege what fraud Bank of America, N.A. and
17 the other Defendants have committed as to the Plaintiff. Rather,
18 the Plaintiff pleads that he disputes that Bank of America, N.A.
19 had the right and authority to enforce the deed of trust which
20 secures the Note. Merely because there is a dispute over certain
21 rights does not mean that fraud has been committed. It is common
22 for parties to disagreement, and such disagreement is often
23 necessary for there ever to be a lawsuit.

24 Plaintiff has not alleged tender in this case, has not alleged
25 grounds by which tender should be waived, and fails to allege
26 grounds by which the Note is not enforceable. The Complaint is
27 deficient on its face and must be dismissed without prejudice.

28 The motion to dismiss is granted, without prejudice and with

1 leave to amend.

2 **FRAUD AND THE UCL**

3 Plaintiffs also claims that the Defendants committed fraud in
4 relation to his loan. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
5 interprets Federal Rule of Federal Procedure 9(b), as made
6 applicable to this adversary proceeding by Federal Rule of
7 Bankruptcy Procedure 7009, to require that the complaint
8 (1) specify the fraudulent representations; (2) specify the
9 representations were false when made; (3) identify the speaker;
10 (4) state when and where the statements were made; and (5) state
11 the manner in which the representations were false and misleading.
12 *Decker v. GlenFed Inc.*, (*In re Glenfed, Inc. Sec. Litig.*), 42 F.3d
13 1541, 1547 n.7 (9th Cir. 1994) (en banc), superseded by statute on
14 other grounds as stated in *In re Silicon Graphics, Inc.*, 970 F.
15 Supp. 746, 754 (N.D. Cal. 1997); *Lancaster Cmty. Hosp. v. Antelope*
16 *Valley Hosp. Dist.*, 940 F.2d 397, 405 (9th Cir. 1991); *Vess v.*
17 *Ciba-Geigy Corp.*, 317 F.3d 1097, 1103-04 (9th Cir. 2003). This is
18 consistent with common law fraud in California. *Seeger v. Odell*, 18
19 C.2d 409 (1941), and *Manderville v. PCG&S Group*, 146 Cal.App.4th
20 1486 (2007). Merely because a dispute exists between the parties
21 does not support a claim for fraud. The Plaintiff must at least
22 plead more to survive a motion to dismiss.

23 A fraud claim is subject to the additional pleading
24 requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(b) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7008.
25 The Plaintiff may not merely recite the statutory elements for
26 fraud, but must plead a plausible case based on the alleged facts in
27 this case.

28 This Plaintiff first alleges that Defendants committed fraud

1 in securitizing his note. It is contended, without support, that
2 any potential subsequent sale or transfer of the Note (an
3 instrument, and likely a negotiable instrument) must have been
4 first disclosed to the Plaintiff prior to his borrowing the money
5 from Bank of America, N.A.. No legal basis for this contention has
6 been presented to the court. In response to this allegation, Bank
7 of America, N.A. directs the court to paragraph 20 of the deed of
8 trust, which the Defendants have included as an exhibit, but has
9 not been included as part of the FAC. While the Bank is correct
10 that this paragraph discloses that the Note may be transferred, it
11 is buried in a number of dense, legalistic paragraphs separate and
12 apart from the Note or the loan documents.

13 More significant to the court is that the Debtor never alleges
14 that he intended to be part of a further transaction concerning the
15 potential sale or transfer of the Note. The only transaction
16 between the Plaintiff and Bank of America, N.A. was the Plaintiff
17 obtaining loan proceed from the Bank. The Debtor obtained a loan
18 and had set terms by which he had to repay the obligation.
19 Irrespective of what further transactions occurred with the Note,
20 the Plaintiff's obligations and rights would did not change.

21 Plaintiff further alleges that this securitization somehow
22 stripped off the security interest. As to the first allegation,
23 Plaintiff fails to state how having his note sold or transferred to
24 the GSR-09 trust caused him any harm or what fraud was committed to
25 this Plaintiff. If there is no harm, there is no relief that the
26 court can grant. It is not alleged that any of the Plaintiff's
27 rights and obligations under the Note were altered.

28 As to the second contention, there has been no legal authority

1 presented to the court for proposition that securitizing a note
2 somehow strips off the security interest. It settled law that a
3 promissory note and its security interest are inseparable; an
4 assignment of the note carries the security interest with it.
5 *Henley v. Hotaling*, 41 Cal. 22, 28 (1871); *Seidell v. Tuxedo Land*
6 *Co.*, 216 Cal. 165, 170, 13 P.2d 686 (1932); *accord Carpenter v.*
7 *Longan*, 83 U.S. 271, 274 (1872); *see also* Cal. Civ. Code § 2936
8 (West 2010). So, as to these claims, the Motion to Dismiss is
9 granted without prejudice.

10 Plaintiff also claims fraud in relation to the UCL. The UCL
11 prohibits unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices. Cal.
12 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et. seq.* While Plaintiff goes into great
13 detail about what he believes are the fraudulent business practices
14 of Defendants, he falls to allege both how they could have cause
15 and that they did cause any actual injury he suffered as a result.
16 The Plaintiff can seek to recover that person interest in money or
17 property which he lost due to the unfair competition. *Pineda v.*
18 *Bank of America, N.A.*, 50 Cal. 4th 1389, 1401 (2010). The 2004
19 amendments to the UCL specifically require that the Plaintiff have
20 suffered an actual injury. California Business and Professions
21 Code § 17204, *Kwikset Corp. V. Superior Court*, 51 Cal. 4th 310
22 (2011). The allegations in the FAC does not relate to conduct of
23 the Defendants as to the Plaintiff in his transaction, but what
24 subsequently occurred between the Defendants and other persons.

25 As such, Plaintiff's claims under the UCL are dismissed
26 without prejudice and with leave to amend.

27 ///

28 **RESPA**

1 Plaintiff also alleges violations of the Real Estate
2 Settlement Procedures Act ("RESPA"), 12 U.S.C. § 2605(e). RESPA
3 creates a series of rights and obligations as between borrowers,
4 lenders, and loan servicers, including an obligation for loan
5 servicers to respond to borrower inquiries. The servicer is then
6 supposed to correct any errors, provide information as to why the
7 account information is not in error, or explain why the information
8 requested is unavailable. 12 U.S.C. § 2605(e)(2).

9 According to plaintiff, on January 21, 2010, Plaintiff
10 received a "Debt Verification" letter pursuant to 15 U.S.C.
11 1692(g). This obligation arises when a debt collector (someone
12 other than the original creditor if the obligation was obtained
13 after it went into default, 15 U.S.C. § 1692(g), is attempting to
14 collect a debt. This provision requires that, upon written
15 request, for the collector to verify the obligation for the debtor.
16 However, a verification does not mean that the debt is proven to
17 the satisfaction of the debtor, but that the collector reasonably
18 confirm the obligation from the creditor. *Clark v. Capital Credit*
19 *& Collection Servs.*, 460 F.3d 1162, 1174 (9th Cir. 2006).

20 Plaintiff believed it incorrectly stated the amount he owed,
21 so he requested an accounting pursuant to 12 U.S.C. § 2605. (Amd.
22 Compl. ¶ 47.)¹⁴ One reason for the requested accounting is that
23

24 ¹⁴/ Though early in the pleading stage of this case, the
25 Plaintiff has not provided any indication of how he believes the
26 payments were misapplied or the correct computation of this debt
27 based on the payments the Plaintiff made on the loan. Rather, it
28 appears that the "misapplication" of payments is based on a
contention that third-party events relating to the
"securitization of the note," default swaps, and other
transactions should inure to Plaintiff's benefit and repay his
obligation for the monies he borrowed.

1 Plaintiff believed that third-party payments were being incorrectly
2 applied. (Amd. Compl. ¶ 42.) These third-party payments included
3 the default swaps, traunch sales, sales of certificates in GSR
4 2003-9, and TARP monies. For unstated reasons, Plaintiff asserts
5 that post loan closing sales and transfers of the Note inure to his
6 benefit.

7 Defendants counter that Plaintiff failed to state a claim
8 under RESPA because what he filed was not a qualified written
9 request. However, as mentioned, Plaintiff alleges that he did
10 submit a qualified written report. (Amd. Compl. ¶ 47.) For
11 purposes of determining the propriety of a dismissal before trial,
12 allegations in the complaint are taken as true. *Kossick v. United*
13 *Fruit Co.*, 365 U.S. 731, 731 (1961). Taking Plaintiffs allegation
14 as true, he did file a qualified written report. But this does not
15 determine the ruling on this part of the motion.

16 Defendants contend that even if the Plaintiff alleges having
17 made a qualified written request's RESPA claim is deficient because
18 Plaintiff failed to allege any actual harm. *Pok v. Am. Home Mortg.*
19 *Servicing, Inc.*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9016 (E.D. Cal. 2010). From
20 the pleadings, it is difficult to tell what harm, if any, Plaintiff
21 suffered as a result of not getting the full accounting. In fact,
22 it appears that the only harm asserted is that the Plaintiff does
23 not get to participate in the post loan closing transactions
24 involving the Note. Having shown no right to participate in the
25 post loan closing transactions involving the Note, Plaintiff has
26 not alleged damages, if any, from an alleged violation of this
27 RESPA provision.

28 As such, Plaintiff's RESPA claims are dismissed without

1 prejudice and with leave to amend.

2 **TILA**

3 Plaintiff next alleges that Defendants violated the Federal
4 Truth in Lending Act (TILA) by failing to disclose the Pooling and
5 Securitization Agreement (PSA) and its surrounding circumstances.
6 Plaintiff seeks rescission and damages. However, Plaintiff entered
7 into the contract on August 13, 2002, which is when the alleged
8 violation occurred. TILA has a statute of limitations for
9 rescinding contracts, which runs for three years from the date of
10 the transaction. 15 U.S.C. § 1635(f). As the transaction date was
11 August 13, 2002 (over eight years before the filing of this
12 adversary proceeding), the statute of limitations has run as to the
13 rescission claim. TILA also has a statute of limitations for
14 damages, which runs one year from the date of the occurrence of the
15 violation. 15 U.S.C. § 1640(e). As the date of the violation was
16 August 13, 2002, the statute of limitations has also run as to the
17 damages claim.

18 Further, Plaintiff fails to allege how the failure to disclose
19 the PSA violated Plaintiff's rights under TILA. Nothing has been
20 alleged by the Plaintiff concerning the terms of his loan. Rather,
21 he merely asserts that he should have been told of the intended
22 future financial transactions of Bank of America, N.A. and others
23 concerning the negotiation and transfer of the Note. No basis has
24 been provided to the court for such a contention.¹⁵

25
26 ¹⁵/ Plaintiff's contention that he should be allowed to
27 participate in and benefit from the Note being negotiate in the
28 future raises significant issues for borrowers. Participation
swings two ways, both to the benefit and detriment of the
participants. Plaintiff has not contended that he was a
participant in the future transaction for both the gain and loss.

1 For both of the independent grounds of (1) the statute of
2 limitation have expired, and (2) no actual damages having been
3 alleged, no plausible TILA claims have been pled. The TILA claims
4 are dismissed without prejudice and with leave to amend.

5 **CLAIMS UNDER CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE § 2934**

6 Plaintiff alleges that California Civil Code § 2934 requires
7 notice to the trustor upon substitution of the trustee. However,
8 Section 2934 merely states that when an assignment is recorded it
9 serves as constructive notice of its contents. Section 2934 does
10 not create a cognizable claim for the failure to record a document.
11 Though Plaintiff also asserts that California Civil Code § 2924 has
12 been violated by Bank of America, N.A. he fails to plead a
13 plausible claim for recovery under § 2934 or § 2924.

14 Plaintiff's claim for relief under 2934 is dismissed with out
15 prejudice and with leave to amend.

16 **BREACH OF CONTRACT**

17 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants breached their contract by
18 instructing Reconstruct to file a notice of default. The standard
19 elements for a breach of contract claim are "(1) the contract,
20 (2) plaintiff's performance or excuse for nonperformance,
21 (3) defendant's breach, and (4) damage to plaintiff therefrom."
22 *Wall Street Network, Ltd. v. New York Times Co.*, 164 Cal. App. 4th
23 1171 (2008).

24 It is alleged in the FAC that the contract was breached by
25 failing to comply with the contractual provisions by (1)
26 instructing ReConTrust to file a notice of default identifying Bank

27 From the FAC it appears that Plaintiff is seeking to stake out a
28 position that the financial system takes risks and invests its
monies to derive a benefit solely for the Plaintiff.

1 of America, N.A. as a beneficiary and (2) having ReconTrust
2 identify itself as the agent for the beneficiary.

3 Plaintiff's claim fails on several grounds. If taken as true
4 that the Note had been conveyed, thereby taking the deed of trust
5 with it, then there were no contractual rights to enforce. Bank of
6 America, N.A. cannot "breach" a contract in which it no longer has
7 any obligation to perform. Conversely, if there was still a
8 contract between the Plaintiff and Bank of America, N.A. the
9 alleged default (improperly proceeding with a foreclosure) did not
10 exist. Plaintiff pleads that he defaulted on the Note due to his
11 illness and sought a loan modification.

12 Plaintiff's claim also fails on its face because of the second
13 element. Plaintiff must plead his performance or excuse for
14 nonperformance. Here, Plaintiff failed to perform – he stopped
15 paying on the note – and his complaint has provided no reason why
16 he his nonperformance should be excused. The court cannot draw the
17 reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the
18 misconduct alleged, *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556, if Plaintiff has not
19 pled why his lack of performance is excused.

20 Further, Plaintiff has not pled any damages flowing from the
21 alleged breach of contract. If no contract exists, then no
22 foreclosure occurs. If the contract exists, then Plaintiff has not
23 pled any damages Plaintiff's claim for breach of contract is
24 dismissed without prejudice and with leave to amend.

25 **UNJUST ENRICHMENT**

26 Plaintiff claims that Defendants made millions in shorting
27 GSR-09 and should have to disgorge those profits. Besides the fact
28 that Plaintiff gives no reason why he is entitled to the alleged

1 ill-gotten gains, unjust enrichment is a "general principle,
2 underlying various legal doctrines and remedies, rather than a
3 remedy itself." *Melchior v. New Line Productions, Inc.*, 106 Cal.
4 App. 4th 779 (2003) (internal citations ommitted).

5 As Plaintiff has failed to state a cause of action in regards
6 to the disgorgement of the "ill-gotten" gains, this claim is
7 dismissed without prejudice and with leave to amend.

8 **DECLARATORY RELIEF**

9 Finally, Plaintiff alleges that multiple parties have claimed
10 ownership of his note. Plaintiff seeks declaratory relief to
11 determine which party actually holds the note and is entitled to
12 payments.

13 Declaratory relief is an equitable remedy distinctive in that
14 it allows adjudication of rights and obligations on disputes
15 regardless of whether claims for damages or injunction have arisen.
16 "In effect, it brings to the present a litigable controversy, which
17 otherwise might only be tried in the future." *Societe de*
18 *Conditionnement v. Hunter Eng. Co., Inc.*, 655 F.2d 938, 943 (9th
19 Cir. 1981). The party seeking declaratory relief must show (1) an
20 actual controversy and (2) a matter within federal court subject
21 matter jurisdiction. *Calderon v. Ashmus*, 523 U.S. 740, 744 (1998).
22 There is an implicit requirement that the actual controversy relate
23 to a claim upon which relief can be granted. *Earnest v. Lowentritt*,
24 690 F.2d 1198, 1203 (5th Cir. 1982).

25 The court may only grant declaratory relief where there is an
26 actual controversy within its jurisdiction. *Am. States Ins. Co. v.*
27 *Kearns*, 15 F.3d 142, 143 (9th Cir. 1994). The controversy must be
28 definite and concrete. *Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Haworth*, 300 U.S.

1 227, 240-41 (1937).

2 Taking Plaintiff's facts as true, he may be entitled to a
3 determination of to whom he is obligated to pay in satisfaction of
4 the claim on his property. However, the court cannot determine
5 which Defendants, if any, are actually asserting interests in the
6 note and deed of trust and which are persons that the Plaintiff is
7 asserting may claim an interest in the note and deed of trust.
8 Given the other uncertain pleadings in the Complaint, the court
9 determines the declaratory relief cause of action fails to plead a
10 plausible claim. If the Plaintiff believes that a proper
11 declaratory relief claim exists, he can include it in a second
12 amended complaint.

13 The claim for declaratory relief is dismissed without
14 prejudice and with leave to amend.

15 **JURISDICTION FOR ADVERSARY PROCEEDING**

16 Jurisdiction for this Adversary Proceeding exists pursuant to
17 28 U.S.C. § 1334 and the referral to this bankruptcy court pursuant
18 to 28 U.S.C. § 157. This court is authorized to consider whether,
19 in the interests of justice or comity with state courts, from
20 abstaining to hearing a proceeding related to a case under
21 Title 11. 28 U.S.C. § 1334(c)(1). Abstention may be raised by the
22 court *sua sponte* or on motion of a party. *Smith v. Wall Mart*
23 *Stores*, 305 F.Supp.2d 652 (SD MISS 2003).

24 The Plaintiff's Chapter 7 bankruptcy case was filed on May 20,
25 2010. The Chapter 7 Trustee filed a Report of No Distribution on
26 August 21, 2010. Dckt.28. On September 7, 2010, the Plaintiff
27 obtained his discharge. The discharge terminated the automatic
28 stay as to the Plaintiff and property of the Plaintiff, but not

1 property of the bankruptcy estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(C). It
2 wasn't until almost three months after the discharge was entered
3 that the Plaintiff amended his Schedule B to list the claims in
4 this lawsuit as an asset and claim them as exempt. Dckt. 33. No
5 proof of service of the amendments to Schedules B and C have been
6 filed by the Plaintiff. There is no evidence in the record to show
7 that the Chapter 7 Trustee is aware of this asset.

8 In the months that have passed the Chapter 7 trustee has not
9 asserted any interest in the claims in this adversary proceeding.
10 The Plaintiff represents that he has discussed the claims with the
11 trustee, but no appearance has been made by the trustee, nor has
12 there been an abandonment of the claims.

13 The Plaintiff has chosen to proceed in a Chapter 7 case and
14 immediately discharge his debts, rather than consummate a plan of
15 reorganization and make provisions for some payments to creditors.
16 This litigation has no bearing on the treatment of creditors,
17 payment of claims, or administration of property of the bankruptcy
18 estate. There appears to be no connection or reason for this
19 adversary proceeding to be before this court other than it is a
20 remnant of the completed Chapter 7 proceeding.

21 If the Plaintiff elects to file a second amended complaint, he
22 must be cognizant of this jurisdictional issue and be prepared to
23 address why this court should not abstain from hearing this
24 adversary proceeding. No Bankruptcy Code issues appear to remain
25 in this case, nor any assets to be administered by the trustee or
26 the Plaintiff through any plan.

1 **RULING**

2 The motion to dismiss is granted and the case is dismissed
3 without prejudice with respect each and every claim stated therein
4 against each and every Defendant. The dismissal is without
5 prejudice and with leave to amend.

6 This Memorandum Opinion and Decision constitutes the court's
7 findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.
8 52 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7052. The court shall issue a separate
9 order consistent with this ruling.

10 Dated: June 23, 2011

11 /s/ Ronald H. Sargis
12 RONALD H. SARGIS, Judge
13 United States Bankruptcy Court
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28