

Real Property, Financial Services, & Title Insurance Update: Week Ending March 23, 2018

April 02, 2018

REAL PROPERTY UPDATE

- Foreclosure / Amendments to Conform to Evidence: trial court erred in allowing Wells Fargo to amend its complaint during trial to conform to evidence presented of two unpleaded modification agreements – Tracey v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., as Trustee, No. 2D16-5091 (Fla. 2d DCA Mar. 23, 2018) (reversed and remanded)
- Tax Appeal / Defense Class: trial court properly denied unit owners' motion to certify a defense class with the association as the owners' class representative in appraiser's appeal of value adjustment board's determinations because the individual condominium units are assessed in the name of the individual owners, not their association, and section 194.181 requires the taxpayer to be a party defendant Central Carillon Beach Condo. Ass'n, Inc. v. Garcia, Nos. 3D17-1198 & 3D17-1197 (Fla. 3d DCA Mar. 21, 2018) (affirmed).
- Interpretation of Condo Declaration: trial court erred in concluding that sections of declaration required commercial unit owners to obtain the association's board's written consent before altering landscaping appurtenant to their units Waverly 1 & 2, LLC v. Waverly at Las Olas Condo. Ass'n, Inc., No. 4D16-2866 (Fla. 4th DCA Mar. 21, 2018) (reversed and remanded)
- Foreclosure / Standing: plaintiff failed to prove at trial that initial plaintiff had standing to enforce lost note when it filed suit Vieira v. PennyMac Corp., No. 4D16-3430 (Fla. 4th DCA Mar. 21, 2018) (reversed and remanded)
- Foreclosure / Standing: heirs did not have standing to challenge borrower's liabilities under note
 and mortgage, and, even if they did, it was their burden to plead affirmative defense regarding a
 forbearance agreement Rouffe v. CitiMortgage, Inc., No. 4D16-3583 (Fla. 4th DCA Mar. 21, 2018)
 (affirming judgment of foreclosure, except as to the amount due under note, and remanding for
 further proceedings to determine that amount)

FINANCIAL SERVICES UPDATE

- FCCPA/FDCPA: denying summary judgment on FCCPA claim alleging violations of 559.72(9), based upon finding that a reasonable jury could *infer* actual knowledge of illegitimacy of amounts sought, despite lack of evidence that Defendant had actual knowledge that amounts sought were illegitimate Revien v. Eastern Revenue, Inc., No. 9:17-CV-80959 (S.D. Fla. Mar. 21, 2018).
- FDCPA/FDUTPA: claim for FDCPA violations based upon two letters sent to plaintiff in June 2013, were time-barred and alleged "continuing violations" based upon filing of collection action could not save time-barred claim; FDUTPA claim against attorneys based upon sending pre-suit demand letters could not survive dismissal because alleged conduct "had zero connection to any 'trade or commerce'" In re Smith-Johnson, No. 8:16-BK-02514-RCT (Bankr. M.D. Fla. Mar. 19, 2018).

TITLE INSURANCE UPDATE

- Exclusion 3(a): Exclusion 3(a) applies in Texas to preclude coverage to insured who engaged in substantial misconduct where insured was aware that a judgment had been entered against him but did not have "full knowledge" that the judgment had attached to his real property, because to find otherwise would require an insurer to guarantee an insured's debt where the insured intentionally refuses to fulfill his financial obligation and would receive an inequitable windfall at the expense of the insurer Moser v. Fidelity Nat'l Title Ins. Co. (In Re Moser), Civil Action No. 4:17-CV-104 (E.D. Texas Mar. 21, 2018) (affirming bankruptcy court)
- Fortuity Doctrine: In Texas, the fortuity doctrine applies to relieve insurers from covering inequitable behavior that an insured undertook prior to purchasing a "backward looking" title insurance policy, and precludes coverage when an insured is or should be aware of an ongoing, progressive or known loss at the time the policy is purchased Moser v. Fidelity Nat'l Title Ins. Co. (In Re Moser), Civil Action No. 4:17-CV-104 (E.D. Texas Mar. 21, 2018) (affirming bankruptcy court)

Related Practices

Real Property Litigation
Title Insurance
Consumer Finance

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be

given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.