#### CARLTON FIELDS

# Real Property, Financial Services, & Title Insurance Update: Week Ending February 26, 2021

February 26, 2021

## Real Property Update

 HELOC / Authentication: A home equity line of credit is not a negotiable instrument, is not selfauthenticating, and must be proven in support of summary judgment – Demakis v. Suntrust Bank, No. 2D19-3751 (Fla. 2d DCA Feb. 24, 2021) (reversed and remanded)

## Financial Services Update

- FCCPA / Preemption: Argument that TILA and Regulation Z preempt provision of FCCPA is insufficient basis for removal – Hargrave v. Capital One Bank, N.A., No. 8:20-cv-01231 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 7, 2021)
- TCPA / Online Fax Service / Standing: Users of an online fax service do not endure the type of harm Congress intended to protect against under the TCPA and lack standing – Scoma Chiropractic, P.A. v. Mastercard Int'l, Inc., No. 2:16-cv-00041 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 29, 2021)
- TCPA / Fax / Class Certification: Plaintiffs failed to prove that stand-alone fax machine class was ascertainable and, in any event, plaintiffs' proposed method for determining class membership required many individualized inquiries and, thus, common questions did not predominate Scoma Chiropractic, P.A. v. Mastercard Int'l, Inc., No. 2:16-cv-00041 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 29, 2021)
- TCPA / Constitutionality: Supreme Court's opinion in *Barr v. American Association of Political Consultants Inc.* did not render entire TCPA unconstitutional Johansen v. Loandepot.com LLC, No. 8:20-cv-00919 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2021)
- TCPA / Arbitrability: Claim premised on unwanted text messages subject to arbitration provision contained within terms of service Regan v. Pinger, Inc., No. 5:20-cv-02221 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 23, 2021)

- TCPA / ATDS / Plausibility: Allegations of two calls from defendant, along with a pause after each call, were insufficient to raise the assertion that defendant used an ATDS above a speculative level Hildre v. Heavy Hammer, Inc., No. 3:20-cv-00236 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 25, 2021) (granting motion to dismiss with leave to amend)
- FDCPA / Debt Collector: Creditors and those that acquire debts not "in default" are not "debt collectors" under the FDCPA Avent v. Platinum Plus Auto Prot., No. 1:19-cv-01494 (N.D.N.Y. Feb. 23, 2021)
- FCRA / Actionable Conduct / Personal Jurisdiction: Failure to investigate and remove disputed information does not "arise from" mailing of loan-related communications – Mednik v. Specialized Loan Servicing, LLC, No. 1:20-cv-00427 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 23, 2021)

### Title Insurance Update

- Conversion: Georgia law precluded plaintiff's conversion claim against title insurer where plaintiff failed to allege a specific and identifiable amount of money lost First IC Bank v. N. Am. Title Ins. Co., No. 1:19-cv-05055 (N.D. Ga. Jan. 21, 2021) (order granting defendant's motion to dismiss)
- Breach of Contract: Plaintiff could not sue title insurer for breach of contract where title insurer's closing protection letter was not the operative letter at closing, as the closing attorney obtained a subsequent closing protection letter and title policy from another title insurance company First IC Bank v. N. Am. Title Ins. Co., No. 1:19-cv-05055 (N.D. Ga. Jan. 21, 2021) (order granting defendant's motion to dismiss)
- Coverage / Specific Use: Title insurer did not have a duty to cover costs associated with replatting the insured property to allow for residential development where the policy did not provide insurance for a specific use and instead insured title subject to the conditions of the original plat VACC LLC v. Chicago Title Ins. Co., Nos. 1 CA-CV 19-050, 1 CA-CV 20-0075 (Ariz. Ct. App. Feb. 23, 2021) (affirmed)
- Unmarketability: Plaintiff's argument that the restrictions, as incorporated into the plat, rendered the property unmarketable for the use plaintiff intended (residential development) failed where plaintiff could have sold the property in the same manner that it acquired it and plaintiff's hope that the property could be marketed for a use inconsistent with the plat was not insured under the policy –VACC LLC v. Chicago Title Ins. Co., Nos. 1 CA-CV 19-0508, 1 CA-CV 20-0075 (Ariz. Ct. App. Feb. 23, 2021) (affirmed)
- **Title Delivery**: Plaintiff's argument that title was not properly delivered as described in Schedule A of the purchase agreement failed where Schedule A and the warranty deed contained the same legal description VACC LLC v. Chicago Title Ins. Co., Nos. 1 CA-CV 19-0508, 1 CA-CV 20-0075 (Ariz. Ct. App. Feb. 23, 2021) (affirmed)

• Bad Faith: Title insurer did not act in bad faith where it had a reasonable basis for denying plaintiff's claims – VACC LLC v. Chicago Title Ins. Co., Nos. 1 CA-CV 19-0508, 1 CA-CV 20-0075 (Ariz. Ct. App. Feb. 23, 2021) (affirmed)

#### **Related Practices**

Real Property Litigation Consumer Finance Title Insurance

©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.