



Real Property & Title Insurance Case Law Update

Recent Opinions of Interest to
Real Property Litigators and Practitioners

Week Ending February 8, 2013

By the Carlton Fields Real Property Litigation Practice Group

For more information about Carlton Fields' Real Property Litigation Practice Group, please visit us at:
[Real Property Litigation](#)

CONTENTS

Selection of Case Summaries

- I. Florida State Cases
- II. 11th Circuit Cases
- III. Title Insurance Cases
- IV. The Weekly Update Team

I. FLORIDA STATE CASES – BRIAN VAVRA

- **Voluntary dismissal: trial court has jurisdiction to reinstate voluntarily dismissed action for fraud on the court only where the fraud resulted in plaintiff securing affirmative relief to the detriment of defendant and, upon obtaining that relief, plaintiff dismissed to prevent court from undoing improper relief** – [Pino v. Bank of New York](#), No. SC11-697 (Fla. Feb. 7, 2013) (answering certified question of 4th DCA)
- **Marketable Record Title Act: exception for easements in MRTA at F.S. § 712.03(5) applies to rights-of-way held in fee by Florida Department of Transportation** – [Clipper Bay Invests., LLC v. DOT](#), 1D11-5496 (Fla. 1st DCA Feb. 5, 2013) (affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded for entry of order)
- **Coastal Barrier Resources Act: Florida Public Service Commission has exclusive jurisdiction to decide whether county and private landowners may obtain judicial relief regarding proposed electrification of No Name Key pursuant to the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 3501-3510** – [Roemmele-Putney v. Reynolds](#), No. 3D12-333 (Fla. 3d DCA Feb. 6, 2013) (affirming dismissal with prejudice for lack of jurisdiction)
- **Boundary lines: where property description in deed uses monuments rather than metes and bounds there is a rebuttable presumption in favor of finding that the boundary between properties is the centerline of the monuments referenced in the deed** – [Bischoff v. Walker](#), No. 5D11-2194 (Fla. 5th DCA Feb. 8, 2013) (granting motion for rehearing, withdrawing previous opinion and substituting new opinion finding material issues of fact regarding ownership of submerged land) [Ed. Note: original opinion covered in Update for week ending Dec. 14, 2012]

II. 11TH CIRCUIT CASES – JIN LIU

- **TILA: to meet TILA requirements, it was not necessary that response to borrowers' inquiry**

explicitly state that servicer was master servicer where response explained servicer was mortgage servicer and collected payments on behalf of mortgage owner and, thus, borrowers could have concluded servicer was master servicer – [Kissinger v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.](#), Case No. 12-60878-CIV (S.D. Fla. Jan. 30, 2013) (granting defendant's motion for summary judgment and denying plaintiffs' request for hearing)

III. TITLE INSURANCE CASES - CHRIS SMART

- **Class Action: insurer's attempt to moot class plaintiff's claims failed where tender of settlement failed to include offer of judgment and amounts for claimed punitive damages, treble damages, and attorney's fees** – [Winston v. Stewart Title and Guar. Co.](#), Case No. 10-2425 (D. Md. Feb. 4, 2013) (memorandum denying motion to dismiss)
- **Class Action: class plaintiff may be entitled to seek certification prior to determination of mootness as an offer of individual relief would nullify plaintiff's ability to obtain class certification of claims** – [Winston v. Stewart Title and Guar. Co.](#), Case No. 10-2425 (D. Md. Feb. 4, 2013) (memorandum denying motion to dismiss – dicta)
- **Closing Protection Letter: where CPL covers agent's failure to follow lender's closing instructions which require lender's mortgage to be recorded in first position and commitment requires payment of prior mortgage but policy contains express exception for prior mortgage, the CPL and policy, when read together on a motion to dismiss, are unclear and will not support dismissal based on exclusion in policy** – [Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Bank of America, N.A.](#), Case No. 11-4062 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 31, 2013) (memorandum denying motion to dismiss)
- **Damages: section 8 of title insurance policy is not a defense to coverage, but a limitation of liability, and failure to raise section 8 as an affirmative defense does not waive its application** – [Levy Gardens Partners 2007, L.P. v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co.](#), Case No. 12-30010 (5th Cir. Jan. 31, 2013) (affirming judgment)
- **Damages: zoning endorsement did not create stand alone coverage for loss relating to any use of property and coverage was limited pursuant to section 8 of the policy to the difference in value between the title of the insured property with and without the zoning encumbrance** – [Levy Gardens Partners 2007, L.P. v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co.](#), Case No. 12-30010 (5th Cir. Jan. 31, 2013) (affirming judgment)
- **Apparent Agency: CPL issued for benefit of lender was not evidence of agent's apparent authority to act as insurer's agent with respect to closing and escrow and, therefore, seller was not entitled to recover closing funds stolen by agent from insurer** – [4-J L.P. v. Scarbrough & Weaver, PLC](#), Case No. 2012-00284-COA-R3-CV (Tenn. App. Jan. 31, 2013) (affirming summary judgment)

THE WEEKLY UPDATE TEAM



Dana Blunt
dblunt@carltonfields.com
813.229.4156
[bio](#)



Stefanie Lincoln
slincoln@carltonfields.com
813.229.4148
[bio](#)



Jin Liu
jliu@carltonfields.com
813.229.4209
[bio](#)



Brian B. Vavra
bvavra@carltonfields.com
813.229.4385
[bio](#)




Ilan Nieuchoicz
inieuchoicz@carltonfields.com
305.539.7381
[bio](#)



Lauren Sembler
lsembler@carltonfields.com
813.229.4384
[bio](#)



Chris Smart
csmart@carltonfields.com
813.229.4142
[bio](#)



Sara Witmeyer
switmeyer@carltonfields.com
813.229.4267
[bio](#)



Recent opinions of interest to real property litigators and practitioners is provided periodically by the Real Property Litigation Practice Group of Carlton Fields for the attorneys of the firm. Carlton Fields attorneys may pass these updates on to clients and friends of the firm. Any recipient of these updates outside the firm is reminded, however, that they are not intended as legal advice or as a substitute for legal consultation in a particular case or circumstance. Federal statutes require unsolicited e-mails in certain categories to be labeled as advertisements, and to offer the ability to “opt out.” We doubt that this falls within those categories, but regulations have not been adopted, and the situation is ambiguous. If those laws do apply, they require the following disclosure: This communication is an advertisement. If you do not wish to receive such communications from Carlton Fields in the future, either reply to the e-mail address from which you received it, or e-mail optout@carltonfields.com, and we will not send them to you.

www.carltonfields.com

Atlanta • Miami • New York • Orlando • St. Petersburg • Tallahassee • Tampa • West Palm Beach

Copyright 2012 Carlton Fields, P.A.