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does have the same issue, and there's an ice storm coming
to Dallas tonight, so we'd like to get her out.
    THE COURT: Oh, boy. That was my expectation to
pick up with that witness and then pick up with
Ms. Newberry's witnesses after that. So happy to have
the witness retake the stand. Why don't you recall her.
    MR. STERN: We call Ms. Fay Janati.
Whereupon,
            FAY JANATI,
was administered the following oath by the court clerk.
    THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear that the
testimony you give in this action shall be the truth, the
whole truth, and notbing but the truth so help you God.
    THE WITNESS: I do.
    THE CLERK:Thank you. Please be seated.
Please state your full name spelling your first and last
for the record.
    THE WITNESS: First name Fay, F -- like Frank --
a-y. Last name, Janati, J-a-n -- like Nancy ... a-t-i.
    DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
BY MR. STERN:
    Q Good morning, Ms. Janati.
    A Good morning.
```
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    Q Do you remember testifying in this case
previously?
A Yes, sir.
Q And between that previous testimony that you
gave and today, are there any answers that you would
change from when we were here on November Ist?
A No.
Q Okay. So we'd like to pick up where you --
where we left off. To refresh your recollection a little
bit, we were talking about two versions of the promissory
note, the original which did not have Nationstar's name
stamped on the endorsement, and then the copy of it; do
you recall that?
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. Just so that we can all refresh our
recollections, can you tell us again which is the correct
version of that note?
A The correct version of the note is the original
note that has been kept with our custodian. And that is
intact. There's no changes to that. It is a true,
official original note that was in custody and later on
with our attorneys.
MR. STERN: Okay. And just for the record,
Your Honor, we had marked that as Exhibit 200. And now
under our stipulation, it's Exhibit 2, the original one.
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THE COURT: I'm sorry. Exhibit - joint exhibit
now?
    MR. STERN: Joint Exhibit 2.
    THE COURT: Number 2?
    MR. STERN: Yes.
    THE COURT: Okay. I see it. Thank you.
BY MR. STERN:
    Q Okay. Now, Ms. Janati, we have a couple of
questions for you. First, can you remind us what
custodial processes, if any, were taken, with respect to
the original note?
    A Usually after the note is originated, all the
original documents goes to the custodian. In this case,
US Bank was custodian of the note all the time.
    The original note stays with the custodian until
it's needed for foreclosure action and provided for our
foreclosure attorncys.
    Q Is that what happened with Ms. Rodriguez' note?
    A Yes, sir.
    Q Okay. So when the US -- when the note was
needed for foreclosure purposes, to whom at US Bank
transfer the note?
    A T0-at the time it went to our foreclosure
attorney.
    Q Do you know who that is?
```

A I believe McCarthy \& Holthus.
Q Okay. Now, let's talk a little bit about the copy with the Nationstar name stamped on the endorsement. Are you able to tell us why or to explain how that - let me phrase it this way: Are you able to explain to us how the Nationstar stamp ended up on the copy?

A We do have a system, imaging system that we call Remedy, R-e-mee-d-y. The copies of origination and lost mitigation, a lot of documents arc uploaded in that Remedy software that we call it our imaging.

It appears that unfortunately somebody that I don't know who, priated a copy and stamped Nationstar Mortgage on the copy of the note and it went to the foreclosure attorney.

I do not know who did it and why did it, but I'm here to apologize. It was wrong. It should have not happened. And, again, I'm sorry. One employee made one mistake.

Q Okay. And following up on that, Ms. Janati, what access did that - did that employee have, which I understand you weren't able to identify, but what access would that employee have had to the original note?

A None.
Q And why is that?
A When 1 see that the copy was stamped -



|  | CROSS-EXAMINATION |  | A I would say - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BY MS. NEWBERRY: | 2 | THE COURT: Hold on a minute. |
| 3 | Q Going back to your testimony from November 1st, | 3 | MR. STERN: I'm going to object just on the |
|  | you indicated that you worked in the resolutions | 4 | grounds that this is beyond the scope of our direct ex |
|  | deparment at Nationstar; is that right? | 5 | THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer. |
|  | A Actually, I was quality control, and I did | 6 | THE WITNESS: Yes. There is a lot of trail |
|  | quality control for all the modifications. My current |  | If you talk to the borrower, it is recorded and it is in |
|  | title is litigation resolution. At my current position, |  | the system. If we make mod effort, it is in the system |
|  | we make every effort - | 9 | was able to go look at it. A lot of notes are |
| 10 | Q Okay. | 10 | system. |
| 11 | A - to come up with resolution. | 11 | BY MS. NEWBERRY: |
| 12 | Q -- quality, when you worked in quality control, | 12 | Q And in that trail from 2011 to 2013, did anyon |
| 13 | you were responsible for looking over the modifications | 13 | raise an issue with regards to the note with the |
| 14 | as they were being generated by the subordinate employees | 14 | Nationstar stamp on it being incorrect and improperly |
| 15 | to you, correct? | 15 | sent to your attorney? |
| 16 | A Subordinate employees have their own managers. | 16 | A Idon't know. |
| 17 | I was quality control. At the quality control, we pull a | 17 | Q Was there a log written in there where an |
| 18 | sample and we review but not only. What I did was not | 18 | employee caught the mistake, caught the error, or |
| 19 | only modification, but I also did a lot of quality | 19 | addressed it in the Nationstar system? |
| 20 | control for modification. I did origination reviews, REO | 20 | A On the note that I reviewed, I didn't see |
| 21 | reviews, loan app reviews. Modification was another | 21 | anything from Nationstar employee making a note of that, |
| 22 | department that I did. | 22 | however, a lot of those conversations were between |
| 23 | Q During that time period, from 2011, when this | 23 | Nationstar and foreclosure attorney. |
| 24 | loan was boarded with Nationstar, in your function as | 24 | Q You talked about a custodian and you mentioned |
| 25 | quality control, did you ever review this file? 20 | 25 | US Bank repeatedly. It's your understanding that US Bank $22$ |
|  | A No. | 1 | is the custodian for this secured type loan pool and |
|  | Q And from May of '13, when you were promoted to | 2 | obviously Ms. Rodriguez' loan? |
|  | the resolution analyst, did you revicw this file? | 3 | A Yes. |
|  | A May of '13, no. I reviewed the file when it | 4 | Q And that is not a misstatement, that US Bank is, |
|  | came to my attention that I have to review it. | 5 | in fact, a custodian and had possession of the |
|  | Q When was that? | 6 | originating document since its inception in 2005 ? |
|  | A I'm guessing mid-October. Mid-October 2013. | 7 | A Before I came here from my last attorney, I |
|  | Q So October of 2013, was when you first looked at | 8 | asked and I was told US Bank was custody. |
|  | this file? | 9 | Q Who did you ask? |
| 10 | A Yes. | 10 | A Our attorney asked document execution who was |
| 11 | Q Are there - is there a written log that | 11 | the custodian, and I was told it is US Bank. |
| 12 | Nationstar keeps of whoever has looked at this file, | 12 | Q Who- |
| 13 | touched this file, or had access to it? | 13 | MR. STERN: I'm going to jump in here, |
| 14 | A A written log? | 14 | Ms. Janati, and just remind you not to disclose |
| 15 | Q Or an electronic log. | 15 | attorney-client privileged communications. |
| 16 | A I don't understand the question. Nationstar has | 16 | THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 17 | sets of policies and procedures. Depending on the status | 17 | BY MS. NEWBERRY: |
| 18 | of the account, the employees are working on the account. | 18 | Q Who is document execution; what is that? |
| 19 | If it's in lost mitigation, lost mitigation employees are | 19 | A Document execution is another department of |
| 20 | working. If it's in foreclosure, lost mitigation | 20 | Nationstar Mortgage, that they work with foreclosure |
| 21 | continues lost mitigation effort and foreclosure starts | 21 | attorneys to provide documents that is needed. |
| 22 | their procedure. So the employees on the staff. | 22 | Q Okay. So it's an internal organization of |
| 23 | Q The employees you mentioned that are involved in | 23 | Nationstar that you contacted to find out where these |
|  | that, is there a trail of who has touched that file in | 24 | documents had come from? |
|  | your history on the file in your system? | 25 | A I did not contact them. I was told US Bank, 23 |
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someone who made the investigation, and I was told that
US Bank was the custodian of the original note.
    Q Are you familiar with a document called pooling
and servicing agreement?
    A Yes,ma'am.
    Q And have you reviewed the pooling and servicing
agreement that's relative to this loan?
    A For this loan, no, but I have for other loans.
    Q So you looked at them. Are they fairly similar
from loan pool to loan pool?
    A Yes,ma'am.
    Q Have you ever looked at a pooling and servicing
agreement between Bank of New York Mellon and First
Horizon with regards to servicing?
    A Yes, I have. Yes, ma'am.
    Q Okay.
    A I have looked at it.
    Q I'm going to direct your attention to the
binders in front of you. I'd like you to take a look at
Volume 1. I'm sorry. Volume 2, and Number 19. Just let
me know what you've located the beginning of that
document.
    A Okay. I am in it.
    Q Looking at this document, it indicated it's the
pooling and servicing agreement from May 1st of 2005.
```
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    First Horizon Assets Security, Inc. is the depositor.
First Horizon Home Loan Corporation Master Servicer, and
the Bank of New York is the trustee; do you recognize
this document?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q And you've seen a document similar to this
before, correct?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Can you please turn to page 32 on the Bates
stamp.
MR. STERN: Which page is that on the --
MS. NEWBERRY: The Bates -- the top is also 32.
THE WITNESS: 32 of 459 ?
MS. NEWBERRY: Yes, ma'am.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Looking at that document, direct your attention
to the first full paragraph entitled "Servicing
Advances."
A Servicing advances, okay.
Q "All customary, reasonable, and necessary
out-of-pocket costs and expense occurred in the
performance of the master servicing obligations,
including but not limited to the cost of the
preservation, restoration, and protection of a mortgage
property, any expenses reimbursable to the master servicer pursuant to Section 31, and any enforcement or judicial proceeding including foreclosures. The management and liquidation of any REO property or compliance with the obligations under Section 3.9."

Are you familiar with servicing advances and what that means with regards to pooling and servicing agreements?

MR. STERN: Your Honor, l'm going to object. This is not only beyond the scope of our direct, it's not relevant to what we're here to discuss about the mediation.

THE COURT: Ms. Newberry.
MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, she slated that they don't make any money. And she stated that they have no interest in foreclosure because it costs them money.
This document, including all the other corporate documents, shows exactly how they make money doing the foreclosures. It's entirely relevant.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may proceed. THE WITNESS: No, 1 disagree. This document -when we subservice an account, we do get paid from master servicing to process the account.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q I'm going to direct you back to the question I
asked. Are you familiar with the term "servicing" account?

A Yes. I have looked at a lot of servicing agreements and I'm very familiar with servicing agreements.

Q Then I have no doubt that you can answer my questions. Are familiar with the term "servicing advances?"

A Yes.
Q What are those servicing advances?
A I don't know the details of how much Nationstar gets paid on every account, but the servicing advances means if Nationstar as a subservicer has to go through cost of servicing the loan. Master servicers pays Nationstar to be reimbursed for the cost and it's very natural. Making money out of the foreclosure is different than servicing advances. In order to service an account we go through a lot of expenses.

Q I'm going to ask you to just answer the questions that I ask you.

MR. STERN: She is answering the question. MS. NEWBERRY: I asked what servicing - if she knew what servicing advances are.

THE COURT: I'm going to adinonish the witness that, I believe, that your answers are going beyond the
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scope of the question asked. And just so that we can
help avoid the record where you're talking over each
other, answer the question to the best of your ability.
    If there's a follow-up question from
Ms. Newberry she'll ask it. And certainly your counsel
will have opportunity -- or counsel, I should say for the
Respondent, will have the opportunity to follow-up with
additional questions.
    But I will admonish the witness that most of the
answers not only to Ms. Newberry's questions but even to
your questions, Mr. Stern. You are somewhat trailing
into the narrative, which is really not what we look for
in these proceedings, okay?
    THE WITNESS: Okay.
    THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Newberry.
    MS. NEWBERRY:Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q Servicing advances include ancillary costs,
correct?
    A Yes,ma'am,
    Q And ancillary costs are inspection fees?
    A Yes,ma'am.
    Q Foreclosure filing fees?
    A Yes,ma'am.
    Q They are also the fees that are included with
        28
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regard to the late fees that the servicer gets to retain,
correct?
A Does it say here? It is possible every
servicing agreement is different.
Q In a pooling and servicing agreement for a
securitized trust, you are allowed to keep the late fecs
as a benefit of being the servicer or the subservicer,
correct?
A Can you find that in this special servicing
agreement? They're all different.
Q If you'd like to turn to the subservicing
agreement for Nationstar with Bank of New York Melion, I
believe you will find the answer you're looking for,
Exhibit 22, which will be in the next volume.
A Volume 3? Volume 3?
Q Volume 3, yes, ma'am. Turn to page 34.
A 20-
Q 30 --
A 32 and then 34?
Q Correct. The bottom of the page, Article 5,
"Compensation to the servicer." Direct your attention to
page 34 of the Bates stamp. That's where I'll begin the
questions.
A 34 Compensation Article 5?
Q Yes.

A Compensation to the Servicer.
Q Yes. Section 5.1, Compensation to the Servicer: With respect to each mortgage loan as compensation for its services under the agreement, the Servicer shall be entitled to the fees, collectively the servicing fee, set forth in the pricing schedule attached.

Are you familiar with this reference to this document?

A Okay. Yes, ma'am.
Q Okay. And in the next paragraph: As additional servicing compensation, the servicer shall be entitled to retain all ancillary income with respect to the mortgage loan.

A Yes, ma'am.
Q So you get to keep the fees. All of the costs, all of the advances, everything that you put out when you complete the foreclosure and there's an actual monetary recovery from the foreclosure; you get to keep those fees, correct?

MR. STERN: I'm going to object on a couple of basis; form, the question was compound. Also the question lacks foundation particularly on what ancillary income means.

THE COURT: Overruled. BY MS. NEWBERRY:

Q It just described ancillary fees as the inspection costs, the late fees. We didn't mention it, but litigation cost would be included in that as well, correct?

A Yes, ma'am. We do pay for third-party vendors.
We pay them and this is the cost of the servicing an account. This is servicing agreement that I have to say, yes, it's correct.

Q Okay. So your statement before that Nationstar doesn't make any money off of a foreclosure wasn't true, was it?

MR. STERN: Objection. Argumentative.
THE WITNESS: I do not agree with you. It was true.

THE COURT: Overruled. And, Ms. Janati, if you could just pause a little bit, because if counsel is going to object I need to have the opportunity to hear the objection and to rule on it before you finish.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: Ms. Newberry.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q When a foreclosure is completed and the sale of the property occurs at the foreclosure sale, who gets the money first from the proceeds of the sale?

MR. STERN: I object, Your Honor. That calls 31
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for a legal conclusion. It's unsubstantiated.
    THE COURT: Overruled.
    THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question?
BYMS. NEWBERRY:
    Q When a foreclosure sale is conducted, and you've
testified that you've been involved in lost mitigation
for many years and have lots of experience. When the
foreclosure sale is completed and the funds from the sale
are returned from the proceeds of the sale, who in this
chain of the master servicer, the servicer and the actual
owner, who gets that money first?
A When the foreclosure is completed, the property \(\rightarrow\) depending on the servicing agreement, we do service a
lot of banks -
Q When - I'm sorry. I'm going to ask you to answer the question specifically, when the property is sold. Not when it goes to REO. When a third-party comes in and purchases the property and there's actual proceeds of sale, meaning money, who gets that money first?
MR. STERN: Your Honor, I'm going to object on relevance. There's been no foreclosure in this case. Our position here is we're here to discuss whether Nationstar should be sanctioned for a shortcoming in the foreclosure mediation.
THE COURT: Ms. Newberry.

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, in this case there's been repeated foreclosure activity. There's been repeated attempts to take the home from Ms. Rodriguez. There's been numerous fraudulent documents, misrepresentations to the Court in the FMP program.

They stated, their own counsel stated specifically at the first hearing; Why would we do that? We wouldn't do that. We don't have a reason to. We're trying to explain and explore the why. Why do they do this? It's not simply that there was a mistake. There is a motivation and there is intent.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer. BY MS. NEWBERRY:

Q Who gets the money first?
A Did you say, if it goes to third-party sale -
Q Meaning -
A - or REO?
Q Someone comes down to the foreclosure auction and purchases the home, hands over the money to the foreclosure trustee; who does the foreclosure trustee send the money to?

A Because you're servicing the account, it comes to Nationstar, and after all the accounting is done, it will go back to the investor.

Q So Nationstar would get the money from the
foreclosure salc of Ms. Rodriguez' home, recover all of their advanced costs, plus interest that has been accumulating in a collection account, correct?

A No.
Q No?
A No. It depends on the third-party sale amount. Usually, when it goes to \(-I\) have done a lot review of third-party sale. Usually, the third-party sale amount is way below what is owed on the account.

Q Correct. According to the pooling and servicing agreement, before they hand the money over to the investor, Nationstar gets to recover all of their advanced cost plus the interest on the collection account before that money is transferred back to the investor?

A Nationstar gets paid for all the fees that we incurred during the servicing of the loan. The interest it did not say here, and I'm not going to quote myself on the interest, Nationstar is the servicer of the account.

If the account is sold to third party, the money comes to Nationstar. All the accounting is completed, we'll get whatever we spent on the money, and whatever the servicing agreement pays Nationstar to continue servicing the account.

Q So your statement earlier, that Nationstar hasn't made any money on this foreclosure and has costs, 34
what you're really saying is: The monies have been put upfront in terms of those costs and expenses to do the foreclosure, but once you complete the foreclosure, you would recover all of those funds?

A No, ma'am. You are changing my sentences. We talked about what benefit do I get on toreclosing on property. I explained the foreclosure is extremely expensive and no investor, no servicer, no bank wants to go through foreclosure.

We go through foreclosure because of the default. We are not making money off of the foreclosure. We offer mod. We make every effort to come up with resolution.

Now, you're talking about servicing agreement and cost. That's not me. As a subservicer went through to service the account. Number one, the servicing agreement is between the master servicer and me.

They sit down and they agree that for Nationstar to continue servicing this account will need to get paid such and such on each account. And in the servicing agreement, we get paid if we pay anything to third-party lenders.

So we are talking about two different things. The foreclosure itself and servicing an account and what I get paid, that's between the servicing agreement and
```

me. Going through foreclosure, nobody wants a
foreclosure. Not me, not the investor, not the master
servicer. We make every effort to keep the home.
Q I completely understand why the investor doesn't
want a foreclosure because the properties are under water
and there's all these fees that get taken out before they
get any recovery. I don't disagree with you there. I
think we're on the same page on the investor.
But back to Nationstar and Nationstar is the
servicer in what it receives. Late fees. What money has
Nationstar advanced that categorically creates a late
fee? Is there an advancernent of actual hard money for
Nationstar's book for a late fee?
MR. STERN: Object on form.
THE COURT: Overruled. If you know the answer.
THE WITNESS: Are you referring to the late fees
because of the borrower does not make the payment on
time?
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
That is my understanding of a late fee with
regards to a loan, yes.
A Okay. It is on the original note, and the
borrower is well aware of it. They sign at closing, if
they do not make the payment on the 15 day, the late fees
are clsarged to the account.
36
Q And who gets the late fee?
A If the borrower is late, they have to make the
late payment charges.
Q Who gets the late fee?
A It applies to the account. The borrower - the
borrower signed -
MS. NEWBERRY: I'm going to object --
THE WITNESS: -- to make the charges.
MS. NEWBERRY: -- for nonresponsive, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: I don't know if Nationstar
retained the late fee or doesn't retain the late fee,
regardless of that, that's the cost of servicing the
account. We hire employees. We have employees, manager,
we have buildings. It's the cost of servicing the
account.
THE COURT: I think she answered your question.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Looking at the pool -.. I'm sorry, the servicing
agreement that you still have in front of you, I believe
it's Exhibit 22.
A Okay.
Q Going back to page 14. It's 14 in the Bates
stamp, and then there's a Number 20 at the very bottom of
the page in the middle.
A Section 2.2?

```

Q Yes. Books and records.
A Okay.
Q This indicates that, "The record titled to each mortgage in the related mortgage note shall remain in blank in the name of the owner or the investor." Do you recognize that statement?

A I'm reading it for the first time.
Q Okay. Do you have any reason to disagree with that being a contractual obligation of the servicer to not alter the note and to have it remain in blank in the name of the owner or the investor of the property?

MR. STERN: I object, Your Honor. The contract speaks for itself. It says what it says.

THE COURT: She answered the question about how this coniract is implemented by Nationstar.

MS. NEWBERRY: Yes, Your Honor. I'm just laying the foundation to ask those questions.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. You may proceed. Overruled.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Do you have any reason to disagree with this contractural requirement of the servicer having the note remain in blank?

A Yes, ma'am, I agree.
Q So your testimony earlier today, that someone
38
stamped Nationstar into that blank endorsement -
A It says "original note." The original note was never tampered. It was never touched. I apologize that one employee stamped a copy. Original note stayed intact and nobody touched it.

Q Let's talk about that stamp on hat nute. What did you do to investigate where it came from?

A I just looked at the copy and I said, "I'm very sorry that one employee made a mistake."

Q Did you go through the chain of people in the accounting history that had touched this file and ask them if they did it?

A No, I didn't because I was not clear who did it.
Q And you didn't do an investigation to find out who within Nationstar would have had access to the Nationstar stamp in order to create that endorsement?

A No, I couldn't. Again, I have no idea who did it. Somebody printed it and stamped it and sent it to foreelosure attorney. So the fact that it was a copy, it put me at ease, and I'm glad to say that that clerical mistake did not make any changes to horrower's account.

Q So if there had been a stamp on the original note, that would have been a concern to you, but the fact that it was a copy was of no concern?

MR. STERN: Objection, Your Honor. That
```

misstates the testimony. It's argumentative.
THE COURT: Overruled. I think it is a fair question.
THE WITNESS: Once again, ma'am, we are very sorry, and I do apologize to you, Ms. Rodriguez, and this
Court. And one employee at Nationstar made a mistake on
a copy of the note. The fact that it did not affect my homeowner it puts me at ease.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q How did it not affect your homeowner that a forged note was used to prove standing at a mediation?
MR. STERN: Your Honor, objection. Lacks foundation. Argumentative of the fact it was a forged notice. Ms. Janati has repeatedly not only explained that the original was never changed, it was actually admitted, the original into evidence. So the statement that this is a forged note is simply not correct and lacks foundation.
THE COURT: Overruled. You, yourself, said, Mr. Stern, that is about what happened at the mediation. I think this is a fair question that Ms. Janatic can answer.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you repeat your question?
MS. NEWBERRY: Can we have the court reporter

``` 40

```

read it back.

```
(Record read.)
THE WITNESS: A forged note was not used at mediation. A wrong copy was produced at mediation. I don't know why. It should have not been there. Mediation was supposed to be -- in regards to modification for Ms. Rodriguez, the fact that a stamped copy of the note was being produced. I'm shocked to see that. I don't like that it went to mediation. At mediation we didn't need to prove standing because we do have servicing agreement to subservice the account.

At mediation, the goal was to help Ms. Rodriguez to do modification.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q I do not expect you to be familiar with what constitutes a forgery, but I would direct the Court's attention to 205090, which describes a forgery, which is: The alteration of any document recorded or filed in any court or with any public officer or senate assembly or counterfeit or forges the seal or handwriting of another, with the intent to damage or defraud any person.

Doesn't specify that it has to be the original.
THE COURT: The Court will note the definition.
MR. STERN: There a question?
BY MS. NEWBERRY:

Q is there --
MR. STERN: Sorry.

\section*{BYMS. NEWBERRY:}

Q Is there a policy or a procedure in Nationstar with regards to the creation of documents and how they're submitted to your foreclosure attorney?

A Yes, ma'am. We do care about policies and procedures.

Q What is the policy with regard to how documents are transmitted to your attorney?

A Usually if the property goes to foreclosure, foreclosure rep requests the original document from custodian to foreclosure attorney.

Q So when a foreclosure is first initiated, the document from the custodian is supposed to be sent out to the law firm that's going to do the foreclosure?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q Did that happen in this case?
A Idon't know.
Q You reviewed the file?
A Well, as far as when they requested it, I explained the policies and procedures, that is usually when foreclosure starts -

Q You testified earlier that you reviewed this file, correct?

A I reviewed the file in the system. I didn't go to cach department to talk to people. I reviewed the file as far as the timelines. So the timelines as the default occurs, the file is in foreclosure, the foreclosure attorney is hired. And when the foreclosure attorney needs the original note, the original note is requested from the custodian. So these are the policies and procedures and we make sure it follows.

Q So when, on your review of this timeline, did Nationstar ensure that its foreclosure attorney was in possession of the original note?

A I don't know.
Q You don't know?
A Idon't know the date.
Q The year?
A I don't know. I can't say for certain.
Q Was it 2013?
A I don't know.
Q Would like you to look at Volume 5, document Number 46.

A Okay.
Q Do you recognize this document?
A Well, I mean, this is the first time I'm looking at it. Let me read through. Exhibit A, is that where we are at?
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    Q That's document Exhibit }46
    A Okay.
    Q Are you familiar with this document?
    A I am looking at it for the first time, so, I
    mean -
Q "Yes," or "no," are you familiar this document?
A This is the first time I'm looking at this
document.
MR. STERN: I am going to jump in, Your Honor,
just, it's not an objection. It's just for reason we
don't have a copy of it in our binder.
THE COURT: The Court has a copy. If you're not
sure, we can certainly take a quick break.
Mr. Stern, just in the interest of time, if you
want my copy, an additional copy, you're welcome to have
it and I can use the clerk's copy.
MR. STERN: I appreciate that, Your Honor.
Looks like we are also missing 47, just as a heads-up.
MS. NEWBERRY: I am giving him now the
opportunity to review it, Your Honor.
MR. STERN: Your Honor, I'm okay proceeding with
questions on it. The only statement l'd like to make is,
I am not sure where, and I apologize that I don't know
this, but how Ms.Newberry's office came into contact
with it. So I would like to - it looks like this is a
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vendor document and I don't want to waive any
confidentiality objections obviously.
    MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, I anticipated that
question. Here's a screen shot. I got it off of the
Internet. It's posted and published.
    MR. STERN: Okay. With that, I'm not as
worried, but l'd just like to reserve the confidentiality
objection that if this is, in fact, correct that we had
the ability to seal this portion of it or otherwise
protect the confidentiality of the document.
    THE COURT: If looks like it's available to
anyone who wants to access it on the Internet. So Im
sure have a confidentiality issue with it. I'm taking
counsel's representations. I think you should proceed.
MS. NEWBERRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. STERN: And we take it on face value. If it
is on the Internet, of course, we would agree with that.
            THE COURT: Okay. Proceed.
BY MS NEWBERRY:
    Q This document is called Nationstar Mortgage,
LLC, Firm Standards and Practice Policy, and you should
have the opportunity to read that document, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Are you familiar with the terms that are written
in this contract with regard to how your attomeys
interact with you based on this standards and practice?
A How my attorney interacts with me?
Q The foreclosure attorney, we were just
discussing foreclosure attonneys and how the files are sent to them. And how the files are referred to them, and how he would obtain the custodial file. And this is the agreement, as your offenders, those law firms are supposed to interact with you, correct?

A Yes, it is with our agreement, then it is our agreement.

Q Please turn to page 3. Exhibit 46, Bates stamp, 3.

A Okay.
Q Under 1.5, Litigation and Settlement
Negotiation, "Each's firm shall obtain Nationstar's written authorization prior to communicating verbally or in writing, any type of settlement with borrower or their legal representative." Correct?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q. So Nationstar retains the authority with regards to reaching a resolution, not the attomey?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q Okay. And turning to page Number 4, 1.9. Nationstar's Preferred Online Default Reporting Trafficking System. That's called DRTS. Is that the

\section*{imaging file that you're referring to with regards to how} the documents were transmitted to the law firm?

A I don't know. Let me read through. I have no idea.

Q Take your time.
MR. SIERN: While Ms. Janati's reviewing the document, Your Honor, l'd like not so much to object but note that this is a document with which she is not familiar. And to the extent that her responses to this document are intended to bind Nationstar as a company, we think there's a little bit unfairness there.

THE COURT: To be clear, I don't believe she testified that she's not familiar with it. She's simply testifying she's looking at it right now for the first time. I appreciate that may sound like that, bat I don't think we got a clear answer, because I think the question was: Are you familiar with the policy and procedures that are contained in here. And I don't know that she's answered that question. And if she is and she can testify to it, then she can testify to it. If she's not, then she's not.

THE WITNESS: I read through it. This is agreement between us and our vendors. And in my position, I'm just going to say that we are hoping that everybody follows these policy and procedures.
```

BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Are you familiar with a system called DRTS?
A No.
Q How do you communicate with your attomeys when
a foreclosure is sent to them?
A When the foreclosure started, we do have an
assistant that is called LPS, that I also have access to
read through. And usually the communication between
foreclosure attorneys and our foreclosure department is
through LPS.
Q LPS. That stands for Lender Process Services,
right?
A Yes,ma'am.
Q And LPS created a work station desk top program
that allows you to interface with your attomey?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q And the LPS system is owned and operated by a
third party?
A I don't know.
Q Does Nationstar own LPS?
A I have no idea.
Q Turn to page 5, please. 1.10, Escalated
Litigation, It mentions something called a contested
foreclosure group. Are you part of this contested
foreclosure group?

A Yes and no. We do help foreclosure contested group if the foreclosure becomes a complicated contested matter. But I -

Q Is it fair to say that this is a complicated matter, Ms. Rodriguez' forerinsure?

MR. STERN: Objection, Your Honor. Form. The witness hasn't - this is a complicated matter.

MS. NEWBERRY: She testified that they become involved in complicated matters with the foreclosure group. I'm clarifying whether or not this particular loan is a complicated matter that would cause them to be related to the foreclosure.

THE COURT: I'll allow the question. But Ms. Newberry, please let the witness finish answering before you follow-up.

MS. NEWBERRY: Okay, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You may answer.
THE WITNESS: I am not in a position to make a decision if one case is contested, complicated or not, it comes to me and I'm assigned to it and I work it. BY MS. NEWBERRY:

Q In the paragraph with the bullet point says, "The cases will be worked in Serangitis," is that the system you're using on this case?

A I don't know. I did not use Serangitis in this

```
case, and I don't know if it is in Serangitis.
    Q You turn to page 6. Look at 2.3 Foreclosure
Prorated Fee Process.
    A Okay.
    Q Are you familiar with this matrix and this
process?
    A This is the first time I'm looking at it.
    THE COURT: I'm going to admonish the witness.
I don't believe that that answers the question. She's
asking you if you're familiar with the process, and
you're saying that is the first time you're seeing it
written in this document. I don't believe that that
answers the question, and I would like you to answer the
question.
    THE WITNESS: No.
    THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q Can you turn to page 8. Under Section 4,
Foreclosure Overview. In 4.1 Foreclosure File Referral,
it indicates the firm foreclosing in a state that
requires original documents to begin the foreclosure
process, shall follow the provisions for requesting and
using original documents in Section 4.9. Are you
familiar with that procedure at Nationstar?
    A Yes.
```

    Q Under 4.2, Legal Standing. It indicates from
    time to time, Nationstar may seek to use specific title
vendors. What's a title vender?
A The title company that we use to run the title
report.
Q Who is the title vendor in this case?
A Idon't know.
Q Skipping to the next paragraph: The law firm
shall not initiate a foreclosure - skipping the
bankruptcy remarks part of it -- unless it has
independently confirmed a valid chain of title for both
the mortgage and the note by review of all pertinent
documents and verification of appropriate standing of the
party. Are you familiar with that requirement of your
law firm vendor?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q How do they do that?
A When the title - when the foreclosure attorney
runs the title report, they make sure we do have the
first lien and look at the note, look at the note amount,
and they do their search to make sure we have the
priority to start the foreclosure.
Q Where do they obtain the documents that they are
reviewing?
A What document are we talking about?

## system when making that assessment with regards to the

 chain of title?A In regard to chain of title, they would look at the title report, and if it is in regards to standing, they request original note to make sure we are filing the foreclosure by the name of the investor.

Q Turning to page 9. 4.4 Preparation of Legal Documents: Each firm is responsible for preparing all legal documents required and/or deemed necessary to complete the foreclosure action without any additional fee. Are you familiar with that term?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q So you don't pay your lawyers to do whatever foreclosure documents are required. It's just expected that they will do that in conjunction with handling the foreclosure matter on a flat fee basis?

A I don't know about flat fee but I agree on this.
Q Okay. Skipping to the third paragraph in 4.4: Notary shall keep detailed and audible records involved in notary activities. In the event any notary activity requires administration of an oath, shall ensure that such oath is actually administered. Are you familiar with that requirement?

A Yes, ma'am.

Documents. It indicates: The firm agrees to abide by the term of Nationstar's form of a Bailey letter, which shall be enclosed along with an inventory with a shipment of original documents. Are you familiar with that requirement?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q What's a Bailey letter?
A I don't know what it means by Bailey letter, but I'm just going to say that same thing as I said earlier; if they need the original, we order the original from custodian.

Q And if I represent to you that a Bailey letter is a letter that authorizes the law firm to have possession of the original documents, would you have any reason to disagree with that?

## A No.

Q And in the collateral file is there a record kept of where that document has gone when it leaves the custodian's hand and kept in that file for the entirety of the loan - of the loan's duration and existence?

## A 1 don't know.

Q When you testified earlier about a filing imaging system, is that the system that's maintained in LPS?

A No.
Q It's a separate system?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q The Remedy system?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Does the vendor law firm have access to Remedy?
A I don't know.
Q You testified earlier that the note doesn't move around. From origination it stays with the custodian; is that correct?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q So is there any way that any of the servicers, based on your understanding of the industry, would have been in possession of that original note --

A I don't know.
Q - prior to it being sent to McCarthy \& Holthus? MR. STERN: Objection, Your Honor. Form. THE COURT: Overruled. MR. STERN: The question was confusing. THE WITNESS: I don't understand your question, ma'am.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Well, let's start with Nationstar. Did Nationstar ever gain possession of the original note in the collateral file when it took over the loan in 2011? 54

## A Idon'tknow.

Q Based on your understanding of the industry, you made the representation that the note doesn't move around, that you use spreadsheets and you look at the imaging file to see who owned the note and to look at the versions of it, correct?

## A Not the imaging part -

MR. STERN: I'm going to object, Your Honor. I think that misstates her testimony about the custody of the note in this particular case.

THE COURT: She testified earlier that the note stayed with the custodian.

MR. STERN: She did. But that was based on this note, not her understanding of the industry - or I'm not sure what this question was.

THE COURT: Ms. Newberry, why don't direct your question specifically to the note in question in this case.

MS. NEWBERRY: Yes.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q In this particular case, do you know where that note went other than directly to the custodian?

A No.
Q Is there a written record?
A The note stays with the custodian until we have
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first paragraph, it's the last statement.
    THE WITNESS: Okay. Yeah, well, as of
April 30th, 2011, we had 2,176 employees.
    THE COURT: I see the reference now. And the
objection, again, Mr. Stern?
    MR.STERN: Sorry. Relevance. And the document
speaks for itself. I don't know that this witness is in
a position to talk about the overall --
    THE COURT: Again, there will be a foundational
witness then.
BYMS. NEWBERRY:
    Q Do you have any reason to disagree with that; is
it more or less?
    THE COURT: The objection has been made to
relevancy as to what the relevancy is and how many
cmployees they have.
    MS. NEWBERRY: It goes to who was working at
Nationstar at the time of the mediation, Your Flonor. And
the approximate number of employees that are employed by
Nationstar is relevant to that point.
    MR. STERN: We don't believe the point is
relevant, Your Honor. Who cares how many employees
Nationstar had. You know, how does that impact mediation
at all?
THE COURT: Do you have any reason to disagree
```
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with the number?
THE WITNESS: No, if it's here, I'm going to
guess it's accurate.
BY MS NEWBERRY:
Q Also in this document, it discusses loan
servicing. The statement by Nationstar is that we're one
of the largest independent loan servicers in the United
States. And you testified to that here foday as well,
correct?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Our servicing portfolio consists of mortgage
servicing rights acquired from or subservicer for various
third parties, as well as loans we originate for
integrated origination platform; is that correct as well?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q As of March 31st, 2011, our servicing portfolio
included over 404,000 loans with an aggregate unpaid
principle balance of $\$ 67$ billion; would you agree with
that?
A Yes, ma'am.
THE COURT: Ms. Newberry, are you just going to
keep reading from this document?
MS. NEWBERRY: No. No, Your Honor. I'm getting
to my point.
THE COURT: Can you get there quickly, please.

## MS. NEWBERRY: Yes, Your Honor.

BX MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Our -- the last statement: Our servicing segment produces recurring fee based revenues based upon contractually established servicing fees.

A Yes, ma'am.
Q Does that include the advances and the costs that Nationstar is required under subservicing agreement to pay out on the loan?

A I don't know. That's outside the scope of my position.

Q Okay. The next paragraph down it discusses the amount based on the aggregate of the unpaid principle balance. Can you understand how -- can you explain how a servicing fee is related to what the unpaid principle balance is?

A Idon't know.
Q Isn't it true, that the servicing fee, the payment that you collect from a mortgage payment, is based on what the unpaid principal balance is on the loan?

A I don't know. You are going way outside the scope of my position. The servicing agreement is between the two parties that they sign it. So I cannot sit here and testify against our servicing agreement.

Q You testified earlier, that Nationstar doesn't
make any money off of a foreclosure because they have to advance costs and it costs you money, correct?

A Again, what I testify is that we have no gain in foreclosure.

Q I'll stop you there. In addition, we earn interest income on amounts deposited in collection accounts and amounts held in escrow to pay property taxes and insurance which we refer to as "float income." What is float income?

A 1 don't know. I'm going to tell you that if this is the servicing agreement between the two parties, then it's outside the scope of my position.

Q But you made the representation that you don't make any money.

MR. STERN: Your Honor, Im going to object. I think this is a document that was authored by whoever it was authored. I think the witness has stated on numerous occasions and responded to this entire line of questioning that this is outside of the scope of her knowledge.

The witness needs to have personal knowledge to testify about something. This to not a corporate deposition pursuant to Rule 30(b)(6), so I'm going to object to this line of questioning. Ms. Janati explained

```
what she meant by Nationstar not making a profit from a
foreclosure.
    These questions, I think, are of a different
nature or the subject matter is of a different nature and
she's testified she doesn't know.
    THE COURT: Ms. Newberry, any record you want to
makehere?
    MS. NEWBERRY: I will make the record that they
had the opportunity to bring the witness with the best
knowledge to represent their client here today and this
is the witness we've been presented with.
THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection because I do believe that this witness now has multiple times answered what her basis for her response was as to why she believes there's an effort to avoid foreclosure.
And you have made your point through these documents and through the lines of questions, that you believe there is value to Nationstar. I don't know that we're going to get any further to continue down this road of questions, so I'm sustaining the objection.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Do you have any reason to disagree with the statements that are in this document that Nationstar recorded with the SEC?
A The servicing agreement?
```


## Q The registration statement and the servicing

 agreement, do you have any reason to disagree with those documents?MR. STERN: I will restate the objection, or perhaps, I think, this is a foundational objection actually, Your Honor. I think Ms. Janati has already established that she doesn't have much personal knowledge about the statements in this agreement or even how the agreement is made, how it was prepared. I think --

THE COURT: Sustained.
Ms. Newberry.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Do you have subordinate employees that work for you?

A Currently, mo.
Q When you were in quality control, did you?
A No.
Q I will ask you to look at page 5. Paragraph
titled, Culture Credit Loss Ownership and Accountability.
Does Nationstar have a policy with regards to a term called "credit loss ownership?"

A I don't even understand what is credit loss ownership.

Q The statement in the paragraph says, "We establish financial and operational goals across all

```
levels of the organization, and compensation for all of
our employees is based on achieving the desired results."
Are you familiar with that statement?
    A No.
    Q Okay. So just to confirm: You, in October of
2013, you were made aware of a note that had been stamped
with Nationstar relative to Ms. Rodriguez' loan
documents, and since that time, have you requested an
investigation to determine who did it?
    A A copy of a note. Again, I'm going reiterate
again and again, one employee made a mistake and put a
stamp of Nationstar on a copy that did not affect the
borrower. I cannot do any more investigation because I
do not know who did it, but I do apologize for the
clerical mistake.
    Q How many people work in the foreclosure
mediation department at Nationstar?
    A Two different departments: One is foreclosure
department, one is mediation. I do not know the exact
number of employees.
    Q Is it more than ten?
    A Where?
    Q In the mediation department?
    A Yes,ma'am.
    Q Is it more than 20?
```

    A Yes, ma'am.
    Q More than a hundred?
    A No, ma'am.
    Q How do you know that one single employee made
    one single mistake if you don't know how the document was
created?
A Because there is only one floating around. What
do you mean? I see that there is one copy of the note
that is stamped. No one clse produced other mistakes.
Q So you're confident someone within Nationstar
created that document?
A Unfortunately, I'm going to guess, yes. It is
very unfortunate that somebody at Nationstar printed the
note for the copy and stamped it. It is very unfortunate
and I do apologize. But I don't like it that the
foreclosure attorney took it to mediation.
Q How many people have access to the Nationstar
stamp that's used on -- on those?
A I have no idea.
MR. STERN: Object, Your Honor. Object,
Your Honor. Lacks foundation. And it seems that there
is, in fact, a stamp that we don't really know how this
document was created. Whether it was -
THE COURT: She testified somebody, she doesn't
know who printed it out and stamped it, so I'm going to

```
overrule if she knows the answer.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q How many people at Nationstar have access to the
stamp?
    A I don't know.
    Q How many people have access to the system where
they could have printed out the document and created a
stamp?
    A I don't know.
    MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, I have no further
questions for this witness.
    THE COURT: Mr. Stern.
    MR. STERN: Yeah, I have a few follow-ups and I
have -- I'm not sure if - okay, I'm just going to cut
straight to cross.
```


## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. STERN:

```
Q A few follow-ups for you, Ms. Janati. Can you explain to us with respect to the servicing advance, to the extent that you understand this, what is a servicing advance?
A A servicing advance could be anything between inspection fee, paying third party when there's request for BPO. It could be anything. You know, foreclosure
```

referral fee, notary fee. So those are the expenses that
me, as a subservicing, has to go through to continue
servicing the account.
Q Okay. And who pays for those expenses when they
are incurred?
A It's my understanding that we pay them -
Q Okay.
A - when this is incurred.
Q Okay. Again, to the extent that you know, all
of my questions assume that you know the answer --
A Okay.
Q To the extent that you know. How does, if at
all, does Nationstar recover those servicing advances?
A It would be on the servicing agreement. It is
detailed on the servicing agreement that we have when we
took on servicing.
Q Okay. Does Nationstar make profit from
servicing advances to the extent that you know?
A From the actual servicing, I don't know. Again,
I'm not very - you have to look at the detail servicing
agreement. I don't know. But we -
Q That's fair enough.
A -it's just vendor charges.
Q That's fair enough. But we understand that
servicing advances are vendor charges?

```
    A Okay.
    Q Is that correct?
    A Yes, sir.
    Q Okay. Can you tell us, again, just following-up
from what Ms. Newberry asked you: Does Nationstar make
any additional profit under the pooling and servicing
agreement, or any of the other agreements we've
discussed, when there is a foreclosure versus a
successful modification?
    A No.
    Q And just so that I'm understanding, you're
saying, no, it docsn't make an extra profit or, no, you
don't know?
    A No, we don't make extra profit. Foreclosure is
not, you know, we don't want a foreclosure. We are not
making more money just because I'm pushing for
foreclosure. Foreclosure is part of servicing the
account. We make every effort to come up with
resolution.
    Q Speaking of making efforts to come up with
resolution, we understand that the copy with the
incorrect stamp was presented at mediation. How did, to
your knowledge, how did Nationstar change its position
the things it offered, the modifications it considered as
a result of that stamp being presented at mediation?
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    A None. It didn't make any difference. We made
every effort to offer modification to Ms. Rodriguez to
keep her in her home.
    MR. STERN: Your Honor, would you mind if I took
one second to confer with Mr. Schnitzler about something?
    THB COUR': Sure.
    MR. STERN: We do not have anything else.
    THE COURT: Ms. Schuler-Hintz?
    MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: No, Your Honor.
    THE COURT: Ms. Newberry.
    MS. NEWBERRY: Nothing further, Your Honor.
    THE COURT: All right. Ms. Janati, thank you
for your time today. You are excused.
    THE WITNESS: Thank you.
    MR. STERN: Procedurally, Your Honor,Ms.
Janati, respectfully our witness. She was our witness.
I'm}\mathrm{ wondering if - I don't suspect that Ms. Newberry is
going to want to call her again as an adverse witness or
anything. She's got a plane to catch.
    THE COURT: I think we knew that going in.
Ms. Newberry, I assume, would have said something if she
wanted to.
```

MS. NEWBERRY: No, Your Honor. I have no reason to recall her.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

```
    THE WITNESS: I am excused?
    THE COURT: You are excused.
    Why don't we take a five-minute break.
    (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
    THE COURT: Ms. Newberry, your next witness.
    MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, for sake of economy,
we're going to allow Mr. Stem to call his witness. I
will do a cross-examination of that witness even if I
call her, so it makes more sense to do it that way.
    THE COURT: I think that is fine as well. I
appreciate the efficiencies. I know we hope to complete
today, and the Court does intend to take a lunch recess
at some reasonable point so --
    Go ahead, Mr. Stern.
    MR. STERN: Ms. Schmidt will be presenting our
next wituess, Your Honor.
    MS. SCHMIDT: We would like to call Ms. Lindsey
Morales.
Whereupon,
                    LINDSEY BENNETT-MORALES,
was administered the following oath by the court clerk.
    THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear the testimony
you're about to give in this action shall be the truth,
the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you
God.
    THE WITNESS: I do.
    THE CLERK:Thank you. Please be seated.
Please state your full name, spelling your first and last
name for the record.
    THE WITNESS: My name is Lindsey
Bennett-Morales. L-i-n-d-s-e-y, B-e-n-n-e-t-t,
M-or-amle-s.
    THE COURT: You may proceed.
    MS. SCHMIDT: Thank you, Your Honor.
            DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. SCHMIDT
    Q Ms. Bennett-Morales, where are you currently
employed?
    A I'm currently an associate attorney at the
Cooper Castle law firm.
    Q And Ms. Bennett-Morales, on October 6, 2011,
where were you employed?
    A I was a mediation attorney at MeCarthy &
Holthus.
    Q As your -- in your experience with both McCarthy
& Holthus and Cooper Castle, how many mediation or
foreclosure mediations would you say you've attended?
    A I've attended in total approximately 500
```

mediations, although, I will say that includes a period of time where I was representing borrowers, including only the mediations I've attended on bebalf of the
lenders, that's the vast majority of that number of them.

Q So you would say you're very familiar with the Foreclosure Mediation Program?

A Yes.
Q And did you attended mediation that is the subject of this petition?

A Yes.
Q On whose behalf did you attend that mediation?
A 1 attended the mediation on behalf of Nationstar who had hired us as the servicer of the loan

Q Great. And in the exbibit binder, can you take a look - Ill direct you to - 1 believe, it is
Exhibit Number 1.
A Okay. Is that Volume 1?
Q Ithink so.
A Sorry. The adjustable rate note?
Q Yes. And can you take a look at that and tell me if it appears to be the note as it was presented at this mediation?

A Yes. I belicve this is the copy of the note that I presented at the mediation, or a copy of the copy of the note $I$ presented at mediation.

Q And is there any certification that was presented with that note?

A No. We did not have a certificate for the note for the mediation.

Q And to your knowledge of the Foreclosure
Mediation Program rules and statutes as they existed in 2011, is a certified note required?

## A Yes.

Q Now, I will direct you to, I believe, probably
the last volume, Volume 4 perhaps.
THE COURT: We have Volume 5.
MS. SCHMIDT: Oh, okay
THE COURT: If we have exhibit number we can
find it.
MS. SCHMIDT: Sure. It's Exhibit 49.
THE COURT: That's in 5 , I believe
MS. SCHMIDT: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I'm sorry, did you say 49 ?
MS SCHMIDT: 49, yes, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: The BPO?
MS. SCHMIDT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MS. SCHMIDT:
Q In reviewing this document, does this appear to be the BPO that was presented at this mediation?

judicial foreclosure. Would it appear that that was incorrect?

MS. NEWBERRY: Objection. Misstates the testimony.

THE COURT: Can you rephrase the question, please, counsel.

MS. SCHMIDT: I believe, that Ms. Rodriguez testified the first time she heard of Bank of New York Mellon being involved in this loan was at her judicial foreclosure.

I was just asking Ms. Morales if it appears it was incorrect from the document she presented at mediation.

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, still I object. She's drawing a conclusion with regard to what Ms. Rodriguez thought or what she was aware of. What her testimony is, is that she was not aware of Bank of New York Mellon until the judicial foreclosure.

THE COURT: That's my recollection of the testimony as well. I will sustain the objection, but you can rephrase.
BY MS. SCHMIDT:
Q Did you present this assignment at mediation to Ms. Rodriguez and her counsel?

A Yes.

Q I will move on to 52 , Exhibit 52 . Can you explain what this document is?

A Yes. Under the Foreclosure Mediation Rules as they existed at the time of Ms. Rodriguez' third mediation in 2011, there was a requirement for the representative of the lender to provide to the mediator and at the mediation, an evaluative methodology, as well as terms for a short-sale proposal.

So what this document is, is the evaluative methodology that we provided to the mediator in this case, which explains the steps that we - excuse me explained the steps that our client would take in terms of evaluating Ms. Rodriguez for a loan modification. And then also included terms regarding a short sale should the liquidation option come up at mediation.

Q And in looking at the documents presented at mediation as a whole and from your vast experience with the Foreclosure Mediation Program, did you believe that a certificate would issue as a result of this mediation with the documents that you had?

A No.
Q And why do you think that a certificate would issue?

A Primarily because we were lacking in the certification for the note. In my experience, on

offered at this mediation?

A Based on my notes from the mediation, it appears that we made a modification offer that was contingent upon finalization of escrow review. So although I don't recall specifically how much time would have been needed for that, what we were offering at that time was to complete the escrow review, and then if the escrow had come back and we woold have been able to move forward, we would have offered an internal modification. I think it was a mod 24 , where under there was, I think, a temporary reduction of payments up to 24 percent of the gross monthly income.

Q So despite the document deficiencies, the mediation still went forward, there was still an effort to review Ms. Rodriguez for modification assistance?

A Yes. We did conduct the mediation. We did try at mediation to see if we were able to make some sort of offer that would be acceptable to Ms. Rodriguez and her counsel.

MS. SCHMIDT: We have no further questions, Your Honor, I am not sure if Ms. Schuler-Hintz has any.
the Court: Ms. Schuler-Hintz?
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: No questions.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Ms. Newberry.

## MS. NEWBERRY: Thank you.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MS NEWBERRY:

Q Ms. Morales, now, correct?
A Yes. I should have said -I'm familiar with a number of people in the courtroom, and many of them know me under a varicty of names, so I apologize for the confusion. I'll answer to Benmett or Bennett-Morales or Morales. Any of those names are fine.

Q Or Lindsey works?
A Yes, that's right.
Q So Ihave a few questions about the document that we just went through. We'll go through that first.

A Okay.
Q Which volume do you have in front of you? Keep looking through that.

A think I'm on Volume 5.
Q Okay. We'll stick with that one first then. Let's look at Number 48.

A Okay.
Q All right. This is the e-mail that you were referring to with regards to prior mediation. The communication you sent to the mediator as well as myself?

A Yes.

Q Okay, In this statement you said, "Unfortunately, Nationstar reports that's Ms. Rodriguez' collateral file was physically moved to a new building as part of the service transfer." What did you mean by that?

A When we were first - we, being McCarthy \& Holthus, when we were first notified that Ms. Rodriguez had elected to mediate again, the servicer of the loan prior to that time, to the best of our knowledge, was Metlife.

I contacted Metlife after learning that she had elected mediation to discuss with them the documents that they would need to provide for mediation, and was almost immediately informed that the loan had been service relcased to Nationstar.

We then transferred our attention from Metlife to Nationstar to try to obtain the documents for mediation. And I'm frankly a little hazy on the timeline of all of this, but at some point during those communications with Nationstar in our attempt to get the documents, we were informed that the loan had, one, not boarded with them yet electronically; and, two, that the collateral file - or I was informed I should say - that the collateral file had not made it from Mettife to Nationstar in such a way that they would be able to

```
provide us with the documents.
    Q You were present on November 1st as well as
today when Ms. Janati was testifying with regard to the
collateral -- or the custodial entity in this case?
    A Yes.
    Q She indicated it was US Bank; is that your
understanding as well?
    A I think I have to answer truthfully, that I was
not aware until I heard her testimony that US Bank was
the custodian. But I also would not have had a reason to
look into that.
Q She also testified the custodial file remained with the custodian, and that the loan and the documents that were in it didn't move around. Did you hear that testimony?
A Yes.
Q Is that congruent with your understanding with regard to this particular mediation, why there was difficulty in locating the documents?
A My understanding was as I set forth in this e-mail, that the collateral file had not been transferred, whether or not that was a miscommunication to myself from Nationstar I'm not aware -
Q Do you remember if -
A - if there was a guestion raised, I don't know.
```

Q It's okay. Do you remember who you were speaking with at Nationstar?

A No. There may well be record of that communication in the McCarthy Holthus system that I no longer have access to because I'm no longer employed there. But I could tell you that I normally called the mediation report - excuse me, the Nationstar foreclosure mediation team for contact, so it was very likely someone on that team.

Q How many people are on that team?
A Currently, or as of the date of --
Q $\ln 2011$.
A I would guess the number was at the time somewhere in the range of 20.

Q And when you contacted Nationstar about this particular file, did you speak to more than one person in the mediation department from the time you were assigned the file until the time the mediation took place in October of 2011?

A Yes.
Q How many people did you talk to?
A At least two that I recall specifically. It may have been more than that.

Q Do you recall their names?
A I did speak with Damiel Marks on occasion. I
also recall speaking to - I'm sorry, give me a second.
There's another employee who's no longer with Nationstar to whom I frequently refer questions about my mediation files. And if I could recall that gentleman's name for you, I would. But I'm struggling to frankly at the moment, but I did speak with him as well.

Q If I represented to you that that was Jordan Newsome, does that sound familiar?

A Yes. Actually, that was the name I was trying to come up with.

Q What was his role in the mediation department?
A To the best of my knowledge, he participated telephonically in foreclosure mediations, and also was available for status updates prior to mediation or post-mediation if we are in need of an idea of what the review - where we were in terms of a loan modification or review.

Q Did you talk to Jordan about this file?
A Yes.
Q What, if anything, do you recall from your discussions with him and the preparation of this relevant to Ms. Rodriguez being offered a loan modification or not?

A I don't recall specifically my conversations with Jordan. What I can say in response to
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Ms. Rodriguer qualifications for a lean modification, is that prior to the date of the mediation itself, the information I obtained from Nationstar's foreclosure mediation department was that Ms. Rodriguez, one, did not qualify for a HAMP modification due to - as Ms. Janati testified, their understanding of her debt to income ratio.

Two, their is, as I think has been referenced here, quite a lot of loan history, and due to the prior mediations that Ms. Rodriguez had, and so there was concern about the amount of time she had been in default, and that's how that might prevent her due to the high loan balance at that point from being easily modifiable.

I think that the - Daniel Marks, however, at the mediation himself is who I spoke to in regards to mod 24 they were finally able to attempt to offer.

Q And Daniel Marks appeared telephonically at the mediation, correct?

A Yes.
Q And during the mediation, do you recall the mediator asking Mr. Marks to provide his name and title?

A No, I don't. But knowing Mr. Wenzel and his process, it wouldn't surprise me at all if he had, that would be very - what he would do.

Q And Daniel Marks informed the mediator and the
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room that Nationstar owned the loan and serviced it,
correct?
    A That I don't recall. Nationstar is certainly
the servicer, but I truthfully don't recall Mr. Marks
saying that Nationstar owned the loan.
    Q Do you recall him not saying, or do you
specifically remember that he did not say that?
    A No.
    Q You indicated 500 mediations that you've
attended. So you've prepared documents hundreds and
hundreds of times prior to going to mediation under the
rules, correct?
    A Yes.
    Q Takking about your employment at McCarthy &
Holthus as is relevant to the October 2011 mediation, so
excluding the process at Cooper Castle, what was your
obligation as the attorney going to the mediation to
obtain the required documents? What was the process that
at McCarthy & Holthus for you to do that?
    A I'm going to answer for myself as the attorney,
because there is a foreclosure mediation department
consisting of other employees at McCarthy & Holthus who
are not attomeys and also assist in this process.
    So answering for myself, generally, the process
is that upon heing assigned to a mediation, at this -
```
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    and this was the process in 2011 so far as I recollect.
Upon being assigned to a mediation, 1 , as well as the
other members of the foreclosure mediation team, would
reach out to our client, the servicer typically, to try
and obtain original copics - excuse me-copies of the
original note, deed of trust, any assignments of the deed
of trust. And wet ink, blue ink, certifications for
those documents as well.
Also we would reach out to them to request the
evaluation, either an appraisal or a broker's price
opinion. And on the occasion that there was
documentation that would be needed, depending on the
status of this particular file, we would request that
information from them as well.
At the time that this mediation occurred, I
typically made those requests from all of my clients'
telephonically and via e-mail. So we would make those
requests, and then follow-up as the mediation date
approached, if for some reason we hadn't received those
documents yet.
Q Talking specifically about this case, when did
you become aware that they were not going to be able to
provide the original documents?
A You know, to the best of niy recollection, I
became aware of the issue, as I understood it to be, with became aware of the issue, as I understood it to be, with
the documents right before I sent this e-mail. I recall that I received that information telephonically and drafted this e-mail shortly thereafter. So I'm guessing September of 2011.

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, if I may approach the
Witness so I can refresh her recollection?
THE COURT: You may.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MS. NEWBERRY: Let me know when you are finished
reading and then Ill ask my question again.
MS. SCHMIDT: Your Honor, when
Ms. Bennett-Morales is done, I would ask that I could
approach the Witness and take a look at what she is reviewing?

THE COURT: That's - I mean, that's fine. I
normally would -- counsel would indicate what it is that
she is using to refresh her recollection. I thought you
had already done that so I apologize.
That wasn't something that otherwise you have available to you.

MS. NEWBERRY: This has been produced to counsel.

THE COURT: I assumed. I'm sorry, I made the assumption. Why don't you come get it -- Counsel, you can come get it and then you can take a look at it and

## then give it back to Ms. Newberry when you're done.

MS. NEWBERRY: I'm not introducing the actual document.

THE COURT: Just for refreshing, but still
doesn't hurt to reference for the record.
Ms. Newberry, go ahead.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Having reviewed this document, when did you become aware of the fact that Nationstar was not going to have the original documents for the mediation?

A We were aware that there were issues in terms of being able to produce the documents from as those e-mails state, August and potentially prior. I still, though, stand by my prior answer, that I think this was the moment when I had the final realization that we certainly were not going to have the documents required. Because I think, we had been - or I will speak just for myself, I had been helping as the attorncy who had been assigned to appear at this mediation, that Nationstar would be able to, my understanding, locate the documents so that we would be able to present them at mediation.

Q Earlier today we discussed the attomey services agreement for Nationstar and its vendor law firms, and in that document, it indicated that the coliateral files to be requested prior to the initiation of a foreclosure.
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Do you know when the original foreclosure
commenced with regard to Ms. Rodriguez' property?
    A No, I don't. Not off of the top of my head.
    Q You stated earlier this was the third mediation?
    A Yes.
    Q So when you looked back at the file --
        MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: I'm going to -- Your Honor,
    I will object. The agreement that was produced today is
    from 2013. This mediation occurred in 2011. So l'm not
    sure what the 2011 agreement said about obtaining the
    collateral file as the agreement that applied to the
    Nationstar-McCarthy-Holthus relationship.
    THE COURT: I appreciate the objection, Ms.
    Schuler-Hintz. I think you can continue with your line
    of questioning, but, you know, let us keep in mind that
    we need to clarify Ms. Morales' knowledge of the time
    frame, those procedures and if they were applicable at
    the time.
    BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q Regardless of the agreement, in October of 2011,
    when this mediation took place, was it required by the
    law firm torequest from the custodian, the lateral filc,
    or did you always get the documents from the servicer?
    A I don't know. And Y'll try to be more specific.
For the purposes of foreclosure procedures, much of that
```
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    is done through the trustee that McCarthy \& Holthus works
    with, which is Quality Loan Services, who have their own
attorneys.
Nationstar as well as potentially Bank of New
York Mellon, although $I$ am hesitant to testify to that
specifically, may very well have a separate agreement
with the trustee and their attorneys regarding the
documents required to proceed with a foreclosure
activity.

My knowledge at McCarthy \& Holthus my title specifically was mediation attorney, so my knowledge of their procedures really is limited to the mediation program. For that purpose, we obtained documents primarily from servicers so far as I'm aware, although that was not the case in every file.

Those documents were obtained dependent on the file, either sometimes through LPPS, sometimes via e-mail, depending on the system of the client used and what the most expedient way of obtaining those documents were were depending on the file if that makes sense.

Q Did McCarthy \& Holthus require the custodial file, the collateral file, to be in your possession, or did they request it with reference to the mediation?

A Not on cvery mediation. There were cases where the collateral file would have been - and I'm speaking
only for McCarthy and Holthus' Las Vegas offices. On certain occasions, McCarthy \& Holthus would be in possession of the collateral file, the original loan documents for the purposes of mediation.

In other scenarios where the client was able to provide us with a document certification and then true and correct copies of the documents as they existed, we did not have the need to request those collateral documents. And, of course, I can't testify on behalf of Nationstar, but my understanding is that generally servicers, custodians and beneficiaries would prefer not to be transferring their collateral files around, if possible, to ensure their - their safety so to speak.

Q So talking specifically about Ms. Rodriguez' case, did you ever ask Nationstar to sign the certifications for the original documents?

A Yes. We asked Nationstar to provide us with the standard list of the documents that were required for the foreclosure mediation, which included certifications for the note, deed of trust, and assignment of the deed of trust.

Q And did they tell you they couldn't do that or couldn't produce them?

A Yes. That's the information that $I$ was transmitting in the e-mail is that we were made aware
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that we weren't going to be able to provide those at the mediation.

Q Did someone at Nationstar offer to sign a certification for you to produce at mediation with a copy of the note?

A Not that -
MR. STERN: Your Honor -
THE WITNESS: - that I'm aware of personally.
MS. SCHMIDT: Your Honor, before she answers, we just want to object that a lot of what Ms. Newberry is getting in to is attorney-client communication.

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, it's waived at this point. She's been testifying about it. Their own wituess testified about it. And it goes to relevance to the mediation itself.

THE COURT: I think at this point, we do have a waiver, and it is relevant testimony that the Court needs to hear.

MR. STERN: Your Honor, I think it's been - 1 don't want to interrupt Ms. Bennett --

THE COURT: You're fine. Go ahcad.
MR. STERN: -- because we do want to preserve this issue. Your Honor, the judicial review of a foreclosure mediation necessarily tramples a little bit on attomey-client privilege. I understand that,
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however, certainly in the questioning that I had with
Ms. Janati and when policies and procedures were
testified about, it was on a global level of policies and
procedures, because as what happens here, Ms. Newberry is
asking specifically what did you tell Nationstar and what
did Nationstar respond. And from Ms. Schmid's
objection, we hadn't gotten to that level of detail
attorney-client communication.
    And so we believe that that is a distinction
with considerable difference because we're no longer at
the 30,000-foot level. We're down here at this level,
and I think at this point an attomey-client objection is
proper and should be sustained.
    THE COURT: Ms. Newberry.
    MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, preservation of the
attorney-client privilege has to be raised prior to the
information or evidence being produced. In this
particular situation, we have their -- what they claim is
a privileged agreement that was produced. We also have
testimony with regards to the communications back and
forth between the specific rep, Daniel Marks, that was
involved in Nationstar. We also have communications and
testimony that's relevant to all the things that they
discussed and did was beneficial, all of those
communications should have been privileged.
```

96
If they wanted to maintain the privilege, then
they should have raised the objection before
Ms. Benuett-Morales answered any of those questions. But
Counsel was allowing any of the good information to come
out, and as soon as it starts to delve into the area of
bad information, now they want to assert the privilege.
I don't believe the case law in our state allows
there to be a temperament with regards to when privilege
is invoked with regards to what it can protect. You
either have an attorney-client privilege or you do not.
They've waived it, and I believe my line of questioning
is appropriate.
MR. STERN: Your Honor, may I respond?
THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Stem.
MR. STERN: In response to that, Your Honor,
there has been questions about what McCarthy \& Holthus
did, what Ms. Bennett-Morales did in preparation. Prior
to the question that Ms. Newberry just asked, there was
no disclosure of actual communications.
There was no question or answer where either
Ms. Janati or Ms. Bennett-Morales said, I discussed X, Y
and $Z$ regarding this, regarding the Rodriguez file with
my attorneys. At this point, that's what they're asking.
We don't have a problem with them asking about
what McCarthy \& Holthus did on its own to prepare, and we
certainly don't have a problem with them with information saying that there were communications.

At this point, for the first time they're asking
for the content of privileged communications, and that's why the objection is appropriate at this point.

THE COURT: Anything further, Ms. Newberry?
MS. NEWBERRY: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The Court stands by its determination, the objection is overruled. The privilege has been waived and further questioning can take place. Do you need the question?

THE WITNESS: Was there a question?
THE COURT: I think it would be helpful if we had the question reviewed.

MS. NEWBERRY: Can we have it read back, madam court reporter?

THE REPORTER: Sure.
(Record read)
THE WITNESS: I don't recall that I ever
received any communication from Nationstar where there was an offer made at that time.

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, if I can approach the
witness again with the document for recollection?
THE COURT: This the same document?
MS. NEWBERRY: Yes, it is, Your Honor. And I
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will direct you to this paragraph (indicating). Read that again.

A Oh, okay. They were requesting copies of the certification to execute, so that we would have them once the collateral file documents came through.

Q That's what that statement says?
A Well, that's what I'm reading it as. Saying: Can you send me a blank document certification to execute, and then we would have those prepared for the mediation once the collateral file documents came through.

Q So you would prepare -
MS. SCHMIDT: Your Houor, I would object. This e-mail is not in evidence. It's not in the binder that we have. And I'm not sure of the relevance because she's reading from it. She's testified there was no certification. So whether offers were made or not made or whatever communication she had with the client before this, there was no certification of the note presented at mediation.

THE COURT: The document is being used to refresh her recollection, and I think that's how Ms. Morales is using it. And I think that's legitimate. The issue, I think, the question is still pending to be answered as far as whether there was such communication.

```
If your recollection has been refreshed, then, so be it,
or if it -- your answer is unchanged, then so be it.
    THE WITNESS: Well, that's what I stated to
was - is truthfully my understanding of the way the
e-mail was intended. So what Nationstar was requesting
at that time was to be able to execute the document
certifications in lieu of sending the documents they
would hope to obtain from the collateral file. I mean,
prior to that.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Did Jordan Newsome offer to sign a blank document certification to provide a wet ink version because that would be quicker than actually requesting the collateral file?
```

A That's my understanding is be was offering to sign the document - execute - excuse me - to execute the document certifications, because they were concerned that they would not be able to get the collateral file due to the service fransfer upon obtaining those. That's my understanding.

Q So they were willing to sign the certification saying, I'm in possession of the original, even though they weren't and they weren't going to be able to get them?

MS. SCHMIDT: l'm going to object. This goes
beyond refreshing her recollection, She's already testified as to how she understood it. She testified there were no - Court's indulgence.

And she's also contemplating Jordan Newsome with
Nationstar by saying "they" in this case. Ms. Bennett also testified there were no certifications of the note.

THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Can you read the question again or can you ask the question again?

MS. NEWBERRY: Can we have the court reporter read the question.
(Record read.)
THE COURT: I think there might have been more.
THE REPORTER: Ycah.
MS. NEWBERRY: I'll reask the question again.
THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Newberry. And in
light of the objection, just if you are going to be specific let's not --
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Mr. Newsome offered to sign a certification that he was in possession of the original note because that was the factor in requesting the actual collateral file?

A In the e-mail that was sent, my understanding was that he was asking to - if they would he able to execute a document certification at that time knowing
that the collateral file was in transit, we thought, and we would have the document certification for when the collateral file was received and those documents were received.

So I don't know that - I know you gave me that e-mail to refresh my recollection, not having it in front
of me, I don't recall whether or not he said quicker but the idea was to get it done in time for the mediation.

Q So get the certification done in time for the mediation?

A Yes.
Q And that certification that would have been provided that you had a stock form at McCarthy \& Holthus, states because the rules require that the person signing the certification is swearing under penalty of perjury that they are in possession of the original document?

A Yes. Although, as the document certifications for this show, we do sometimes alter those certifications to be clear about what it is we're representing, which is why the ones I presented to, yourself and your client, state that they're certified copies. So we were not saying, of course, that we had the original documents at mediation because we did not. So there are times when those forms were changed to reflect the accuracy of the situation.

Q How many mediations while you were at McCarthy \& Holthus did you handle for Nationstar?

A Gosh, a lot. There are not-I honestly don't have a figure for you. I could make a rough estimate, but they're one of McCarthy \& Holthus' primary clients although not the largest one. So I would say that they made up a significant portion of the mediations that I attended there. I'm sorry, that might be the best answer I can give you.

Q When did you start at McCarthy \& Holthus?
A In January of 2011.
Q. And when did you leave?

A In June of 2013.
Q During that time period, have you ever received a collateral file on a Nationstar serviced loan while you were at McCarthy \& Holthus?

A I don't recall. It's possible. Certainly, I mean, I wish I could be more specific for your purposes and the Court's purposes. We obtain collateral files sometimes for petitions for judicial review, other times for mediations.

Sometimes whether we obtain them or not is dependent on our client, and sometimes it's dependent on the situation of the loan specifically. So it is possible that I had one, but, to be frank, sitting on
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this day as I am now, I'm having trouble recollecting a
specific instance.
Q Would you say it was a rare occasion that McCarthy \& Holthus obtained the collateral file?
A 1 can't speak for their practices now, but at the time in 2011, yes. The vast majority of the mediations I attended, we did not have collateral files for those.
Q Is it fair to say then, you relied on the representations of your client with regards to them being in possession of them when they signed the certification?
A Yes. We would do our due diligence in the sense of requesting the document as required under the Foreclosure Mediation Rules as they existed at the time.
And then obtaining document certifications for those from the client when possible, reviewing the document certifications for compliance with the mediation rules and the documents. And I can speak for myself peripherally here, but than perhaps McCarthy \& Holthus. If a client provides a document and represents that is the current document, than that is the document that we would take to the mediation.
Q Specifically looking at Nationstar as the servicer, how often did you sign the certifications for the deed of trust and the assigment that you would

\section*{obtain from the Recorder's Office?}

A I can't give you a percentage. What I can tell you is that was the stuff that we took after requesting from Nationstar or another client the documents, we were either informed that we would not be able to obtain the documents, or we got, you know, contemporaneously in time close to the mediation and we're doing our best to comply with the Foreclosure Mediation Rules.

Q Was it more often than not during your time period with McCarthy, that you signed those certifications for the deed of trust and for the assignment as opposed to someone at Nationstar executing the certification because they actually had the original?

A No. Actually from Nationstar we obtained document certifications on the majority of mediations that I recall. There were certain clients who perhaps that was their - that was the procedure they had set in place that could be used. But 1 recall through Nationstar we obtained document eertifications.

Q And is it your understanding, that Nationstar is a servicer and very rarely owned the loans that they were servicing?

A As Ms. Janati testified, Nationstar is quite a large servicer, larger now in 2013 than they were in 2011, of course. I believe that most of the time, I
appeared at mediations where Nationstar was a servicer, although, I do recall specific mediations where the loan was owned by Nationstar and also serviced by Nationstar.

Q So it was a possibility that the note that you presented at the mediation in October 2011 with the Nationstar stamp, that was a possibility that they owned it?

MS, SCHMIDT: Object, Your Honor. She's asking Ms. Bennett-Morales to speculate at this point.

THE COURT: Overuled.
THE WITNESS: Nationstar was the servicer of that loan, that was my understanding. As to the endorsement on the note, I don't know that I ever speculated internally as to the reason. We nommally rely on the last assignment of the deed of trust to identify who the beneficiary is. And so that was certainly an anomaly that I know that you and I discussed at the mediation. But I don't believe that I ever thought there was -- I can't say that. I don't recall specifically at this time thinking Nationstar owned the loan. I think they were clear that they were servicer.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Well, if they were the only servicer and there was another actual owner, as an attorney, why would you produce a document that you didn't believe was correct?

MS. SCHMIDT: Your Honor, I object to that. First of all, the actual endorsement doesn't have anything to do with the ownership of the note. It has to do with who has the right to collect payment on the note. And she's mischaracterizing the scenario --

THE COURT: I don't think the form of the question is objectionable. Ill sustain the objection to the form. I will allow you to rephrase.

MS. NEWBERRY: I'll rephrase. BY MS. NEWBERRY:

Q You presented the note indicating that Nationstar had acquired that note, and based on the endorsement, Nationstar was now the owner and holder of the note. Did you believe that that was true at the time of mediation?

MS. SCHMIDT: Your Honor, I'm going to object again. It's essentially the same objection. The endorsement has nothing to do with the ownership of the note, only the right to collect payment.

THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I don't - can you ask your question again, l'm sorry.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Did you believe at the time of the mediation, specifically because the note and the endorsement said
```

that Nationstar -- this was not a blank endorsement in
other words -- it's stamped Nationstar as being the owner
of the note, did you believe that was true?
A I don't remember forming an opinion on that topic. I knew that there was something afoot so to speak, because we had an assignment to Entity $A$ and then an endorsement closed to Entity B.
The reasom I presented the note as I did at mediation, was because it's not my place as their attorney to alter documentation certainly, or take any steps to correct what my client is representing is the true and correct copy that we're presenting. Or, I believe, that that point was representing that this was the most current copy.
So I believe the Na tionstar was the servicer who, I believe, the owaer was based on the assignment was Bank of New York Mellon, and I don't - I remember thinking, Okay, this is a mess but not necessarily thinking beyond that as to what might be going on short of there was apparently confusion.
And on top of that, in terms of the status of the documents, given the fact that I believe at the time that the collateral file is still in transit or there had been some issuc with that. I was really focused at the mediation on that issue. Because I recall prior to the

```
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mediation, being very assertive that Mr. Wenzel was not
going to take kindly first of all, to this e-mail, and
then second of all, to the status of the document that we
had.

Q So it's possible there was another assignment that just hadn't been recorded yet?

A Not to my knowledge.
MS. SCHMIDT: Your Honor, I'm going to object.
It's just that she's calling for speculation again. I
don't think Ms. Bennett-Morales would have any knowledge of that.

MS. NEWBERRY: She's testified that she's been at 500 mediations, Your Honor. I think she's completely qualified to speculate -

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. BY MS. NEWBERRY;

Q Is it possible, that there was an assignment from Bank of New York Mellon to Nationstar that would explain the endorsement on the note that just hadn't been recorded yet?

A In order for the documents to present a complete chain of title, there was either an error at that time with the endorsement. Either we were missing an endorsement, or there was an assignment that had not that we were not aware of or had not been recorded.
```

So it's possible. In terms of this specific file, I'll rephrase - I'll restate that I should say that Nationstar was telling me that they were the servicer. So I never thought that was the issue with the assignment. But those are the two options that were available given the note that we had.
Q Ms. Schmidt asked you about document, Exhibit 52, the evaluated methodology. At the top of that document says, "Attomey for the Bank of New York Mellon frequently known as the Bank of New York."
A Uh-hmm.
Q Did you type that into this document?
A Maybe. I honestly don't remember. There were times when I would update evaluative methodologies to correct who I was representing, and then other times when the evaluative methodology was prepared, and I would review it and execute it. So and in this specific instance, I don't recall if I did that or not.
Q Ill direct you, then, to the last page, which is page 3.
A Uh-hmm.
Q In that opening paragraph, it indicates that Metlife Home Loans, a division of Metlife Bank NA will evaluate the borrower. Did you type that into the document?

```

A On the final page?
Q Yes, on page 3.
A No. I did execute the document.
Q By electronic signature, correct?
A Yes.
Q And it's dated October '24th of 2013 ; is that correct?

A Well, that is what it's dated. I'm assuming that that is not the date that it was -

Q Because you no longer worked at McCarthy \& Holthus at that time?

A Yeah. I'm assuming that the date it was originally done was the date of the mediation, and that that is printed at a later date, perhaps that is that date.

Q So these documents were kept in an electronic form in the law firm? They weren't printed out and kept in a hard copy in the file?

A There is a hard copy, or there should very well be a hard copy in the hard mediation file. There is also an electronic copy of - I don't know about the entire mediation file, although that certainly well may be the case. And then an electronic copy to the foreclosure file that this might be kept in.

Q So at the time of mediation, your understanding
```

was you were representing Nationstar. But this document,
this evaluative methodology that's presented at the
mediation, on one page it indicates that you represent
Bank of Ncw York Melion, and then on another page that
you represent Metlifc Home Loan?
A Correct. I'm sure the Metlife reference is the prior servicer, and clearly that is in error for the date that the mediation occurred. Metlife was the prior servicer. At the time of the mediation, the servicing had occurred although it was very close in time.
McCarthy \& Hoithus does represent the Bank of New York Mellon, For the mediation, I appeared on behalf of Nationstar; however, that is the scrvicer who I was there for. So although technically the firm also represents Bank of New York Mellon.
Q Is it fair to say that this document is a little confusing on who you represent and who is appearing at the mediation?
A I think if you take the long view in the sense that you trace it back from Nationstar to Metlife with the service release, and then you look at the fact that McCarthy \& Holthus represents Bank of New York Mellon and Nationstar, and the fact that BONY is the beneficiary, it does make sense.
But I will say, yes, there was the entities

```
listed, maybe not BONY, but certainty the Metlife reference, I'm sure it caused some confusion.

Q This evaluative methodology doesn't specifically state whether or not Ms. Rodriguez was eligible for a modification?

A No. The evaluative methodology explains the steps that the servicer will take to determine whether or not Ms. Rodriguex qualified for modiffcation.

Q And at the time of this mediation, October of 2011, the rules required an evaluative methodology to be produced at the mediation confidentially to the mediator showing that the servicer beneficiary had evaluated the homeowner for retention options?

A We were required to produce an evaluative methodology. What was contained in the evaluative methodology has, as I'm sure you're aware, bcen the subject of a number of Petitions for Judicial Review.

I don't recall truthfully whether or not the
evaluative methodology was required to inciude steps that
the servicer had taken versus the steps that the servicer would take to review. That's the only quibble that I would have with that.

But in terms of the content, it's my understanding has always been that the servicer or the representative on behalf of the beneficiary or servicer
or lender, whatever term you are looking to use in this particular case, would include an explanation of how the loan to be evaluated for both retention and liquidation options.

Q So this was a generic explanation that was provided in that time period by McCarthy \& Holthus to satisfy the requirement of an evaluative methodology at mediation?

A The evaluative methodologies produced by McCarthy \& Holthus did to a certain extent change from client to client, so I would not say that they are generic. I would say that many of them are similar to one another because in many cases, particularly when we're talking about loans that are eligible for HAMP, we are looking at very similar sets of reviews.

However, the short sale information, of course, Is specific to the loan. So there is specific imformation to Ms. Rodriguex' loau contained in here, and then there is also - I wouldn't call it generic but there's also a more standard set of what the scrvicer, that's a more standard explanation of what the servicer would take to review.

Q Draw your attention to the next exhibit, which is 53 . This is a copy of the collateral file that has been produced in this matter by the current law firm for

Nationstar. Have you ever looked at that document before?

A No. The collateral file I have not ever seen. No.

Q Will you, then, turn to Exhibit 46, it's in the same volume. THE COURT: While she's doing that, Ms. Newberry, for streamline purposes, how much more time do you believe you have with this witness? MS. NEWBERRY: Only a few more questions. I'm at the bottom of my list. THE COURT: Okay. Procced. Go ahead. MS. NEWBERRY: Okay.

\section*{BY MS. NEWBERRY:}

Q Have you ever seen this particular document, Nationstar Firm Standards and Practices Policy? Looks like Version 6.1 of 13.

A don't know that I've seen this version of this document.

Q Have you seen a version of this document?
A I have seen-yes. Between Nationstar and the law firms that it has hired to represent it, I have seen similar agreements, policies and descriptions of the expectations that Nationstar has for the attomeys that it has hired to represent them in foreclosure actions and
```

mediation.
Q And did you see an agreement like this with
Nationstar when you worked for McCarthy \& Holthus?
A Yes.
Q And is there a policy at the law firm that you
review the agreement at any point during your employment?
A Yes.
Q When?
A There - I don't know that there is a specific
date so to speak. There is not like an annual review
date that I'm aware of at least. We were expected to
have knowledge of these for every client that McCarthy \&
Holthus represented. When new firm standards policies
and procedures were presented to us for our client, we
were expected at that time to review those and have a
working knowledge of them.
So if they were updated, we, of course, would
have provided an updated version and expected to become
familiar with how to implement those.
Q And in your employment at Cooper Castle, do you
also have a agreement with regards to the law firm's
representation of Nationstar that you testified you still
represent Cooper Castle?
MS. SCHMIDT: I object as to relevance. Not
only not having to do with the agreement between
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Nationstar and McCarthy \& Holthus, but it's also beyond
the time frame of when we are talking about here.
THE COURT: Ms. Newberry.
MS. NEWBERRY: I am simply clarifying that her
knowledge is not hased solely on McCarthy \& Holthus, that
the agreement have continued in time and she still
utilizes them to this day.
THE COURT: To the extent that she has that
knowledge?
MS. NEWBERRY: Correct.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Yes. The question was whether
Cooper Castle also has those similar standards and
policies and procedures. And yes, they are in possession
of one, and I am familiar with it or reviewed it for my
purposes there.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q This version says it existed as of 6/1/13. Who
were you working for at that time?
A That was either right before or right after -1
mean, very, very close in time to the date I switched
employers. I believe as of June 1st, I was employed with
Cooper Castle.
Q When you started at Cooper Castle, did they
provide you with a copy of the agreement with all the
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clients you were representing including Nationstar?
A They provided me with access.
Q How do they provide you with access?
A It's electronic access. So it's access so you
can review them electronically.
MS. SCHMIDT: Your Honor, I'm going to object to
this line of questioning. They are going into what's
going on at Cooper Castle. I don't understand how this
has any relevance.
THE COURT: It is hard to understand,
Ms. Newberry, where we're going with this line of questioning. I answered the question that you had with regard to these type of things still out there and going and whatnot. But l'm not sure what we're doing now.

MS. NEWBERRY: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I was trying to lay the foundation. I can ask the question and ifI get --

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MS. NEWBERRY: - a foundation objection I will go back.

THE COURT: Do that.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Did you communicate with Nationstar through the LPS system while you worked at both McCarthy Holthus and at Cooper Castle?
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MS. SCHMDT: Your Honor, again, the Cooper
Castle aspect of these questions are - we think are
irrelevant.
MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, it goes to how
Nationstar's pattern and practices with regard to
foreclosure and the communication with the lawyers that conduct them here in Nevada.

THE COURT: IH allow it.
THE WITNESS: I have communicated with
Nationstar through LPS at Cooper Castle for foreclosure
files. I also have communicated with Nationstar through
LPS at McCarthy \& Holthus, more rarely because my work at
Cooper Castle is not - - is more related to default work.
And I also handle foreclosure mediations, where at
McCarthy \& Holthus, Thandle more mediations and less default work.

I will say, it's my understanding is that
Nationstar changed its policies to some extent regarding
LPS use in the midst of the time frame that we're discussing between 2001 and 2013. Nationstar relies more heavily, to my knowledge at least, on LPS now than perhaps they did at the beginning of this time frame.

I will also say that McCarthy \& Holthus, as I stated previously, a foreclosure mediation department with employees who are not attorneys but who are trained
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\section*{in LPS, who I'm sure communicated much more with Nationstar through LPS than I did as the attorney. \\ My communications with Nationstar regarding Ms. Rodriguez' file specifically was not through LPS but was, in fact, through e-mail, telephone and other methods of communication. \\ Q And what did these employees in the mediation department at McCarthy \& Holthus do? \\ A Starting at the beginning of the timeline, they worked with the mediator to schedule mediation, as well as what mediators, borrowers, schedule mediation. They are very instrumental in obtaining - or, again, this is 2011 I'm talking about - they are very instrumental in assisting us in obtaining financial information from the borrowers frequently. Additionally obtaining the required documentation from our clients. \\ And that's while I was requesting certifications for the note, deed of trust, assignment and so on, these employees were doing the same thing to make sure that they were - to best enable us to get those documents. \\ They also were - I don't know how familiar you are with LPS, but LPS has a number of checklists and tasks to be completed so those employees were helping us maintain our records within the LPS system so that Nationstar could see the status of the file on McCarthy \& \\ 120}

\section*{Holthus' side.}

And did anyone in the mediation department assist you in preparing for Ms. Rodriguez' mediation, any of the documents that were produced?

A The certified copy of the note and deed of trust obtained from the County Recorder's Office was - I'm sure requested and possibly obtained physically from the County Recorder by somebouty else in the mediation department at McCarthy \& Holthus.

Q And they brought you the documents that you, then, executed saying that you were in possession of those certified copies?

A That's my recollection, yes.
Q Did anybody ask you to sign a certification for the note that you produced at mediation?

A No, not that I recall.
Q Who gave you that note with the Nationstar stamp on it?

A I don't kuow. The note - I was very - prior when - okay, let me back up a second. In preparing for this mediation, there were quite a few of us within the mediation department who are familiar with the fact that Ms. Rodriguez had been through mediation a number times before, and that we had difficulty in obtaining mediator statements that would have allowed, prior to Nationstar
and Metlife, to obtain a certificate to proceed with
forcelose, you know, on behalf of the beneficiary at that time.

So we were trying to get the file in the best shape for mediation as possible that we could. So it's very hard for me to pinpoint who actually obtained the copy of the note that I took to mediation. I don't know that it was me specifically or that it was sent directly to me in an e-mail for example.

It's very likely that it was obtained from Nationstar, put into our electronic mediation file, and then I took the copy that we had been told and that I was being told was the most current copy. So I don't have, for example, a name for you unfortunately.

Q You obtained it from Nationstar?
A Yes.
Q You mentioned the other employees at McCarthy \& Holthus were aware of this file. Are you aware of what happened with this file internally at McCarthy \& Holthus after mediation in October 2011?

A My knowledge of this file pretty much ceases after the mediation. I made my report to Nationstar about the events of mediation about the contents of the mediator's statement.

I recommended that Nationstar consider not
proceeding with judicial foreclosure because we obviously had difficulty in succeeding so to speak, at a foreclosure mediation. And what I mean by "succeeding," of course, is we had difficulty in getting a mediator's statement that would allow us to proceed with a foreclosure if we weren't able to modify.

From that point forward, I don't believe that I had really any involvement with the file. 1 know that at some point a judicial foreclosure was begun. That's not a department at McCarthy \& Holthus that I had any real although I know those people who work in that department, of course, I'm not involved in those files, and so at that point that's where my knowledge really ends.

Q Did anyone in the foreclosure unit talk to you about that last mediation prior to filing the judicial foreclosure?

A Idon't - truthfully, even knowing when the judicial foreclosure was actually filled, so I'm not sure - my notes were available to anybody at McCarthy \& Holthus for review. But in terms of that question, I have \(-I\) really struggle to answer it because I don't know the date of the filing but I don't really recall.

Q After the mediation, did anyone from the foreclosure unit talk to you about Ms. Rodriguez' file and prior mediation?

01/11/2014 02:39:50 PM
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A What foreclosure unit are you referring to?
Q McCarthy \& Holthus. The attomeys at McCarthy \&
Holthus that handled filings of judicial foreclosure, did
any of those attomeys contact you to talk about this
particular file after October of 2011?
A I recall the flle coming up in conversation
because it - I recall the file coming up
in conversations -
MR. STERN: Your Honor, we're going to make that
an attorney-client and attorney-work product objection
here. I'm sorry to interrupt the witness, but before it
goes any further, we believe that this is a different set
of circumstances that we're talking about before and the
work-product impressions that Nationstar's intemal
counsel may have with respect to the judicial foreclosure
complaint are certainly privileged, both under
attomey-client and just as important, the attomey-work
product.
So while we don't have a problem with her saying
that they constantly, we object on both those grounds,
work product and privilege, in terms of the confidence of
the internal discussions at McCarthy \& Holthus.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Your Honor, it's also beyond
the scope of this Petition for Judicial Review. The
Petition for Judicial Review addresses the events of the
So while we don't have a problem with her saying that they constantly, we object on both those grounds, work product and privilege, in terms of the confidence of the internal discussions at McCarthy \& Holthus.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Your Honor, it's also beyond the scope of this Petition for Judicial Review. The Petition for Judicial Review addresses the events of the
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mediation.
    THE COURT: This objection is sustained.
    Ms. Newberry.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q Did you review any of the mediations that had
occurred prior to the October of 2011 mediation?
    A I reviewed - yes, I reviewed the mediator's
statement, I believe, there were prior Petitions for
Judicial Review. I looked at the notes from that
Petition for Judicial Review because I wasn't aware at
the time. I believe the prior mediations, at least one
of them if not both, occurred prior to my employment with
McCarthy \& Holthus. So I was attempting to familiarize
myself with what the issues were and had been at those
prior mediations and in Petitions for Judicial Review.
    Q Didyou address all of the prior issues with
your client?
    MR STERN: Object. May 1 make the same
objection, Your Honor. Attorney-client privilege and
work product.
    MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, first of all, it's
waived, and I am not asking the contents of the
communications. I'm simply asking if she addressed those
issues. What she said is not part of the question.

\section*{mediation. This would have occurred long past the \\ mediation. This would have occurred long past the} mediation.

THE COURT: This objection is sustained.
Ms. Newberry.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Did you review any of the mediations that had occurred prior to the October of 2011 mediation?

A I reviewed - yes, I reviewed the mediator's statement, I believe, there were prior Petitions for Judicial Review. I looked at the netes from that Petition for Judicial Review because I wasn't aware at the time. I believe the prior mediations, at least one of them if not both, occurred prior to my employment with McCarthy \& Holthus. So I was attempting to familiarize myself with what the issues were and had been at those prior mediations and in Petitions for Judicial Review.

Q Didyou address all of the prior issues with your client?

MR. STERN: Object. May I make the same objection, Your Honor. Attorney-client privilege and work product.

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, first of all, it's waived, and I am not asking the contents of the communications. I'm simply asking if she addressed those issues. What she said is not part of the question.

THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Yes. I referenced an e-mail at least to Nationstar, that this was a file that had been to mediation previously before that, I believe, I
referenced there had been a prior Petition for Judicial Review in an attempt to make them aware of the urgency so to speak of attempting to comply with the Foreclosure Mediation Rules.

Q And is it your understanding, that McCarthy \& Holthus filed that Petition for Judicial Review?

A Yes. I was not involved in any way with that case, but my understanding is that it was filed hy McCarthy \(\&\) Holthus on behalf Metlife.

MS. NEWBERRY: I have no further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel.
MS. SCHMIDT: I just have a couple questions, and Im not sure if Ms. Schuler-Hintz will have any.

\section*{REDIRECT EXAMINATION}

\section*{BY MS. SCHMIDT:}

Q Ms. Bennett-Morales, did Jordan Newsome ever sign a certification for these documents?

A No.
Q Did anyone sign a certification for the

\section*{documents from Nationstar?}

A No. No one from Nationstar signed certifications.

Q And there was no certification of the copy of the note that was presented, correct?

A Correct.
Q And I believe you testified, that Nationstar xight before this mediation received this service transfer, based on your knowledge of the Foreclosure Mediation Program rule in 2011, how they existed, was there anything that Nationstar could have done to stop the mediation from going forward if they felt that they needed more time?

A No. That's currently as was certainly at the time of this mediation occurred, a major sticking point, that the firms who represent servicers ran into prior to mediation. Because mediators are frequently not particularly sympathetic to the issues caused by service releases. And the issues caused by service releases include the lag time in boarding loans, which is one of the problems that occurred bere.

We - there's no mechanism under the Foreclosure Mediation Rules either currently or in 2011, that would allow McCarthy \& Holthus or Cooper Castle or any other firm to contact the mediator and request that the
```

mediation be moved out purely on the basis of the service
release, so you're basically relying on the mediator's
good will to some extent to do so, if that's what's
happening on that file.
MS. SCHMIDT: I have no further questions.
THE COURT: Ms. Schuler-Hinzz.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Just a couple.

```

\section*{REDIRECT EXAMINATION}
```

BY MS. SCHULER-HINTZ
Q Who commenced the foreclosure in this matter?
A I believe it was the Bank of New York Mellon
with Metlife as the servicer initially, although, I'm a
little hesitant about who the servicer was given the
timeframe of the foreclosure and when the foreclosure
began. It might have been a prior servicer to Metlife at
that point in time.
Q But it was not Nationstar at the time of the
default was recorded?
A Correct.
Q So anything that applies to Nationstar's
practices with regards to a notice of default, Nationstar
wasn't involved at the time?
A Right. By the time - I mean, the notice of
default, is -- as I know you're well aware of what
128
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triggers the election to mediate form, in this case, the
notice of default was filed and Ms. Rodriguez elected
when Metlife was the servicer.
    Q Did McCarthy \& Holthus file the notice of
default?
    A No.
    Q That's done by the foreclosure trustee?
    A Yes.
    Q So the standards and practices that apply to a
law firm and the servicer would not apply to the trustee,
to your knowledge?
    A Yes, that is -- that's my understanding.
    Q There was a lot of discussion about the fact
that the collateral package that the collateral was
always held with US Bank; is that correct?
    A Yes.
    Q The e-mail that everyone referred to discusses
the fact that the collateral changed buildings?
    A Yes.
    Q Did they ever say they changed the holder?
    A No. I put in this e-mail essentially what was
told to me on the phone, at least that's my recollection
because, as I testified earlier, I do recall typing that
e-mail relatively shortly after I received the
information that the collateral file would not be - the
copies for the collateral file wouldn't be available to us at McCarthy \& Holthus at the mediation.

Q So it's not inconsistent that US Bank would have been contimuing with subservicing of the collateral end of the case?

A Right. My understanding is that the building there was confusion of the location within those buildings as the e-mail said.

Q And then just very briefly lastly, at the time the foreclosure - this foreclosure mediation occurred, what did the rules require regarding the exchange of financials and methodology?

A To start with the financials are you referring to the borrower's financials?

Q Yes.
A The Foreclosure Mediation Program Rules request the borrower do the best that they can essentially to produce financials at the time the - in 2011 , borrowers were to do - make their best effort to produce financials for the purposes of review for a loan modification or a liquidation.

I believe in 2011, we were attempting to get those documents obviously prior mediation, ideally ten days before mediation. The evaluative methodology was sent to the mediator only, not to opposing counsel, with
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the rest of the documents or copies of the documents, I should say, with a ten day document exchange as well.

Q So the requirement was that both sides exchange documents at the ten days?

A Yeah, sorry. That would have been the short answer, yes.

Q So it would be very hard in almost all cases, to evaluate the borrower's financials completely because we would not usually have a full document exchange; is that safe to say?

A Yes. Yeah, we - I can speak on behalf of the mediations that I've personally attended not just with Nationstar but with almost every client that I've represented at McCarthy \& Holthus, as well as Cooper Castel, the timelines under which the Foreclosure Mediation Program expects reviews to be done is a major struggle for our clients depending on the complexity of the mediation - excuse me, depending on the complexity of the financials presented and their completeness.

MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Thank you. I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Ms. Newberry.
MS. NEWBERRY: One follow-up question.
III
I/I
```

                    RECROSS-EXAMINATION
    BY MS. NEWBERRY;
Q This was originally scheduled for a date in
early September, do you recall that for this mediation?
A I do recall - I didn't recall the date but I
recall that there had been a prior continuance granted by
the raediator.
Q Correct. And the documents that were produced
to you by the homeowner, Ms. Rodriguez, that occurred at
some point in August, correct, in anticipation of the ten
days prior to the mediation scheduled in September?
A I don't remember. If the documents were
produced ten days prior to that initial mediation date,
then that would have been at that point in time.
Q So continuing it to October 6th, gave an
additional }30\mathrm{ days with regards to those documents being
in the hands of Nationstar?
A Yes. I will say, I believe, that part of the -
if there was, in fact, a delay in completing the review
of the financials. Some of that may well have been duc
to the lag time in boarding the loan electromically,
which, I believe, was the reason the initial continuance
was requested or perhaps one of the reasons.
I'm sorry. I'm not trying to get the time frame
confused, but if the loan had not been boarded fully with
132
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Nationstar at that point, they would have been unable to
complete a review for loan modification with the
financials.
    Q And you contacted our office and asked for a
continuance for that very reason on August 21 st?
    A Yes. I don't know the exact date, but I did
contact and request it.
    Q In August?
    A Yes.
    Q And the continuance was made for the mediation
to take place in October?
    A Yes.
    Q And at the conclusion of September your
representation was unfortunately we don't have all of the
documents for mediation, do we want to - there's been a
difficulty in finding the collateral file, the building
has moved, that e-mail --
    A Yes.
    Q -- that happened September 30th?
    A Yes.
    Q So there was never a representation made at that
point in the e-mail, that the basis of the continuance
was a lack of ability or time to evaluate the homeowner's
financial?
    A No. And we did discuss the homeowner's
financial at mediation, but to a certain extent, I
remember there being a discussion about the question
about - a discussion about whether or not Ms. Rodriguez could afford the loan based on her income versus debt ratio, as was previously testified to.

And I believe there also was an offer made - or an agreement to later agree sort of offer made at mediation, which was that mod 24 depended on the escrow analysis.

MS. NEWBERRY: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Anything further?
MR. STERN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Ms. Morales, you may step down.

Let's take a lunch break. 1:30, that gives us an hour. All right. We'll see you at \(1: 30\).
(Whereupon, a lunch recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Are there any other witnesses that we need to take out of order?

MR. STERN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, we call Kristin
Schuler-Hintz to the stand, please.
III
III

Whereupon,
KRISTIN SCHULER-HINTZ,
was administered the following oath by the court clerk.
THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear that the
testimony you give in this action shall be the truth, the
whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God.
THE WTTNESS: I do.
THE CLERK: Please state and spell your full name for the record.

THE WTTNESS: Kristin Schuler-Hintz. That's K-r-i-s-t-i-n. Last name S-c-h-u-l-e-r hyphen H-i-n-t-z.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

\section*{DIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Would you prefer me to call you Kristin or would you prefer -

A Please, Kristin.
Q I appreciate that. Thank you.
Kristin, you are the managing partner at
McCarthy \& Holthus Las Vegas office, correct?
A Correct, for the Nevada office.
Q And how long have you been the managing partner for the Las Vegas office?

A I have been the managing partner for about a 135
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year and a half.
Q And how long have you worked in the office here
in Nevada?
A Since 2008, January.
Q And what has been your primary function and role
at McCarthy \& Holthus since 2008?
A I was originally hired as an attorney and then
as the foreclosure crisis grew I had staff and then I
became the managing attorney.
Q And as the managing attorney for a year and a
half what has your goal been as a managing attorney?
A Managing staff. Assigning files to people.
Escalating things out on an as needed basis. Hiring and
firing.
Q And are you familiar with Ms. Rodriguez' file
with regard to the foreclosure activity?
A With regard to foreclosure activity as it
relates to the mediation, yes.
Q Okay. And it's my understanding and it's been
represented by several witnesses here today that there
has been three mediations with regards to foreclosure of
Ms. Rodriguez' home?
A I believe that is correct.
Q And all three of those mediations were handled
by McCarthy \& Holthus?
A Correct.
Q And different attorneys appeared at each of
those mediations?
A I believe that is correct.
Q Did you appear at any of the mediations?
A Idon't recall.
Q We'll go through a series of documents. The
binders are in front of you. I will give you a volume
and a number and I will appreciate you taking the
opportunity to look at them and then we'll discuss its
contents.
The first document I would like you to look at
is in, correct me if I'm wrong, volume -- looking at
Exhibit 38.
THE COURT: That is Volume 5.
MS. NEWBERRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Do you recognize this document?
A It is a document certification.
Q How do you recognize it?
A It was the format that was used at that time for
certifying documents for mediation.
Q Is it fair to say that this is a document that
was created by McCarthy \& Holthus?
A It was probably generated by McCarthy \& Holthus,
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yes.
    Q Is this a document that you yourself have issued
in other mediations or for purposes of a foreclosure?
    A It was a document that was used for this
mediation.
    Q Okay.
        MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, I would like to offer
Exhibit 38 into evidence.
        THE COURT: Any objection, counsel?
        MR. STERN: Your Honor, just to relevance. This
pertains to -- this is a Metlife document. We can tell
from the fax up top and we already established that
Metlife transferred the loan to Nationstar in 2011, so
Im not sure what the relevance is.
    THE COURT: I will allow it to make sure that
the Court has the full picture of this loan and the
circumstances surrounding this loan. So the Court will
ultimately weigh all of the evidence that is in this case
as far as what's relative to.
            MS. NEWBERRY: Understood, Your Honor.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q Looking at this document, do you see your name
anywhere?
    A Yes. I am under the McCarthy & Holthus caption.
    Q Did you yourself prepare that document?
```

    A I have absolutely no recollection.
    Q This document is a certification by an Anthony
Francis. Do you know Anthony Francis?
A No.
Q This document says:
"Attached hereto are true and correct copies of
the original assignment and promissory note which is in
the net possession of the affidavit and the deed of trust
executed by Catherine Rodriguez."
Do you have any reason to dispute whether or not
that is true?

## A I didn't execute it, so I have no idea.

Q You heard testimony earlier today that based on the attomey services agreement that often the law firms are asked to prepare documents for the purposes of foreclosure and that including the mediation; is that true?

A Yes.
Q And is it fair to say that your office, based on the pleading paper and the letterhead up above, McCarthy \& Holthus, that your office generated this document for the purposes of if it being executed?

A Yes. We may have generated it but I cannot testify that it is the same document that we originally generated.
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    Q Do you have forms that you keep and use -- at
the time that this was executed was there a form document
that was utilized?
    A Yes.
    Q Is this the form document?
    A I could not tell you; that is going back to
2010. So I would not be able to tell exactly what my
form from 2010 looked like.
    Q And the document was executed it appears on
November 16th of 2010. Any reason to believe that that
date is not accurate?
    A No. There's a fax that says November 16, }2010
There's a notary stamp saying November 16, 2010. And
Metlife says 11/16/2010.
    Q Can you turn to page Number 26 of that document.
        THE COURT: Going from the Bates on the bottom
or the top?
        MS. NEWBERRY:The Bates on the bottom, Your
Honor.
    MS: SCHULER-HINTZ: It's 28 on the fax.
    THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q This document, have you looked at that document
before?
    A Yes. It is a promissory note copy.
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    Q And whose loan does this note pertain to?
    A The Catherine Rodriguez loan.
    Q It is attached to the certification that we have
been discussing at the top of Exhibit 38. Can you look
at page -- actually, look through all the pages going
forward until you reach page 30.
    A That's the adjustable rate addendum to the note.
    Q Okay. Is there an endorsement included in this
copy of the note?
    A No.
    Q Do you have any reason to know why it was not
included?
    A No.
    Q So this document was executed in 2010. It
doesn't contain any endorsement?
    A No.
    Q Can you turn to Volume 1 and look at Exhibit
Number 8. Do you recognize this document?
            A It's a complaint for - summons and complaint
for judicial foreclosure.
    Q And who filed that?
    A McCarthy & Holthus.
    Q Did you sign the pleading?
    A I don't believe so. I think it was a Stephanic
signature. Yes. Signed by Stephanie Richter (phonetic).
```

    Q And your name is included on the counsel of
    record --
A Yes.
Q -- at the top of the caption?
A Yes.
Q Will you look at the Exhibit 1 of that
complaint. What document is that?
A Promissory note.
Q Adjustable rate note?
A Yes.
Q Similar to the one that we just looked at that
was attached to the certification by Metlife?
A Correct.
Q Do you notice any differences?
A This is from the original collateral file that
the title company copied.
Q "That the title company copied." What does that
mean?
A It is the copy made at the time the loan is
signed by the title company and they stamp it as a copy.
Q How do you know that?
A It has a stamp that says that.
Q On the front of this note where it says "I
hereby certify that this is the true and exact copy of
the original Old Republic title?"
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    A Correct.
    Q And you see that document, does that tell you
something different about this copy as opposed to a copy
that doesn't have that stamp?
    A It is a copy. It was made sooner in time.
    Q So this was the copy that was made when the loan
was originated in May 2005?
    A Yes.
    Q And that stamp was put on there. Do you know
why that stamp was put on there?
    A No idea. I don't work for a title company.
    Q At the top of this note there appears to be a
two-hole punch and at the bottom there seems to be a dark
line. Do you have any understanding of how that came to
be on this version of the note?
    A No.
    Q Is there an endorsement included with this
version of the note?
    A Nope.
    Q This is a pleading that was filed in Clark
County in 2012 after the mediation that occurred in
October of 2011?
    A Yes.
    Q And your law firm had represented at mediation
Nationstar and then took the representation of Bank of
    143
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New York Mellon with regard to the judicial foreclosure?
A No. We represented the Bank of New York Mellon
and its servicing agent Nationstar.
Q ln all capacities for both the foreclosure and
the mediation?
A For the purpose of the mediation since the
beneficiary is required to attend we are necessarily
representing the beneficiary at the time through their
servicer.
Q So Bank of New York Mellon was certainly
involved at the time that Nationstar appeared at the
October of'11 mediation?
A Yes.
Q And you had received the documentation and the
information relative to the mediation before this
Petition for the Judicial Foreclosure was filed? You had
received all the documents and information for the
October of'11 mediation?
A The firm had, yes.
Q Okay. Why, then, was a different note produced
at the mediation of October of 2011 than what you filed
as an exhibit to the complaint?
MR. STERN: I will object, Your Honor, just to
the extent that the question suggests that a different
note was produced. These are copies of the note. We

```
already introduced the original note in evidence.
    THE COURT: With the clarification my
understanding is the question had to do with different
copies of the note, but I am going to overrule the
objection and allow the witness to answer.
    THE WITNESS: There are multiple copies of the
notes retained in the electronic imaging system. The
note is the same. This just happens to be the title
company copy. The contents of the note are unchanged.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q "The contents of the note" meaning the printed
substances, but with regard to the endorsernent your
office presented at mediation an endorsement with a
Nationstar stamp on it. Then, when you went to file the
judicial foreclosure case you attached a copy of the note
that did not have any endorsement at all; how did that
happen?
    A I have no idea.
    Q A motion to dismiss was filed in that case,
correct?
    A I believe so. I didn't handle it.
    Q Who did?
    A 1 think Chris Hunter.
    Q And a Verified Amended Complaint was then filed
in response to the Motion to Dismiss?
A. I will take your word for it. 1 did not handle
it.

Q Turn to Exhibit 10. Do you recognize this document?

A Yes. It is the Amended Complaint.
Q Is that your name at the top?
A Yes, it is.
Q Is there anyone else listed as an attorney of record on that document?

A Yes. It states the Complaint was executed by Christopher Hunter.

Q This document was executed December 14th of 2012. And you are saying that is Chris Hunter's signature?

A Yes.
Q Courtesy copies of this were mailed to my office as well was Fennemore Craig, correct?

A That is what the certificate of mailing says.
Q Do you have any reason to think that Ms. Lenardo (phonetic) didn't send it?

A No.
Q Attached to this Complaint, the Amended Complaint, is Exhibit 1, which is the adjustable rate note. It has the Old Republic stamp on the front. Can you look through that document and tell me if you see
where there's an endorsement?
A Yes.
Q Where is that endorsement?
A It's on the page - its between the addendum and the note of the signature page.

Q And that endorsement was added to the exhibit to show that there was standing?

A I don't know.
Q Have you ever seen this document before today?
A This complaint, yes.
Q At the very top of that document there appears to be a white rectangle box. Do you see that on your copy?

THE COURT; Just so we're clear, you are talking about the endorsement page?

MS. NEWBERRY: Yes, Your Honor.
BY MS. NEWBERRY: The endorsement page where it says,
Paid to the order of, and as it reads: First Horizon
Home Loan Corporation, signed by BJ Cool (phonetic). Meant to be paid to the order of, do you see a white rectangular box?

A Yes. I also see white lines across the page itself. A number of them.

Q The white rectangular box, do you know why that . is there?
```

    A No.
    Q Also on that top copy of that note there are no
    two-hole punch marks. Do you know why there is no punch
marks on that when the rest of the document has a
two-hole punch at the top?
A No.
Q Relative to both -- well, after the foreclosure
mediation in this case there was a judicial foreclosure
that we're talking about now, at some point did your
office receive what has been referred to as the
collateral file?
A Yes.
Q Who received that at your office?
A I don't know.
Q Can you turn to Volume 5, Exhibit 53. Is this
the collateral file that has been produced for purposes
of the Petition For Judicial Review?
A Okay.
Q Are you familiar with that document?
A Yes.
Q And you have personally reviewed it?
A Yes.
Q Directing your attention to Nationstar Bates
stamp 4.
A And I assuming you are referring to this
(indicating) page? If there is a Bates stamp, I can't
find it.
Q It's at the very bottom right, it says
Nationstar 0004.
A Hang on. I see it. Okay,yes.
Q The document is dated June 5th of 2013,
addressed to McCarthy \& Holthus?
A Yes.
Q Do you recognize this document?
A It is a mailing document for sending a
collateral file.
Q Is this a document that you have seen throughout
your time working at McCarthy \& Holthus as the
communication that you would receive whenever you
obtained a collateral file?
A No. Different clients have different letters.
But this is one that is currently in use by Nationstar or
was at the time.
Q Drawing your attention to page 6.
A Okay.
Q The document states "Bailey letter." What is a
Bailey letter?
A It's a letter when they are sending the
collateral file to us that we are holding the note for
them.

```
```

    Q Why do they send you a Bailey letter?
    A So they can track where that is.
    Q And once a Bailey letter has been sent does it
    ```
remain in the collateral file?
    A Depends. Different clients have different
procedures.
    Q You said they track where the note has been. Is
that consistent with Nationstar's policies?
    A I don't know. They send us a Bailey letter. We
sign it and send it back or keep it. Depends on the
client's policy.
    Q For Nationstar specifically, did you ever
receive a collateral file that did not have a Bailey
letter in it?
    A 1 don't believe so.
    Q Looking to the next page. It appears to be the
same document as before, however, on the second page of
this letter there appears to be a signature there. Is
that your signature?

A Yep.
Q Is it fair to say that you received the collateral file on June 5th of 2013?

A 1 received the collateral file for my signature. We have a procedure in our office for the receipt of the collateral file, so that is when it was given to me to
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examine.
Q Can you explain that procedure specific to this file?

A That is an internal procedure for our office. It's part of our practice and policies. It is received by the receptionist who logs it. It is given to my assistant who logs into our safe. It is given to me to examine the contents and then execute the Bailey letter before it goes back in the safe.

Q Why such a rigorous policy?
A Notes are valuable.
Q How often do you receive them in your office from Nationstar?

A From Nationstar, I couldn't speculate.
Q Have you ever received one besides Catherine Rodriguez?

\section*{A From Nationstar or in general?}

MR. STERN: Your Honor, I'm just going to object on relevance. We are here on the Rodriguez loan not on other files.

\section*{THE COURT: Ms, Newberry.}

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, we are trying to demonstrate the inconsistencies with the documents. The testimony that has been presented with how these files are handled, what their policies and procedures are and
```

their pattern and practice weighs heavily upon what we
are ultimately determining in this matter, which is bad
faith.
THE COURT: I will allow it.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Have you ever received a collateral file from
Nationstar prior to Ms. Rodriguez?
A Probably.
Q Often?
A Well, we don't receive collateral files - it
depends on the time period. Sometimes we get a lot of
collateral files. Sometimes we don't. I don't generally
memorize who we get them in from.
Q Going further into the collateral file,
directing your attention to page 11. Document says: The
original document file review and checklist. Have you
seen one of these documents before?
A Probably.
Q Did you complete this checklist in this file?
A No.
Q Who would complete the checklist in a collateral
file?
A l have no idea.
Q Moving you to page 30. I'm sorry, 29. The
title page there is Recorded Mortgage Deed of Trust. Do
152
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you recognize that?
A It's a title page. I'm not sure I recognize it
as what.
    Q Tum to the next page, page 30. There is an
indication here of a document being received on June l6th
of 2005. What document was reccived on June 16th of
2005?

A thave no idea. This is not my form.
Q The following document next to that page, is that the deed of trust that you understand was recorded with regards to Ms. Rodriguez' property?

A Yes.
Q Turn to page 54. Page 54 references a note, loan number and buyer named Catherine Rodriguez. Do you recognize this page?

A I presume it is the cover page in the original collateral file.

Q Okay. And the next page following that is titled First Horizon document header. And it indicates document received 8/29/20005. Do you have any reason to dispute that representation?

A I don't know what this is referring to; it's not my form.

Q But this is from the original collateral file
that your office received and signed for?

A Correct.
Q Who did you receive it from?
A We requested it from Nationstar.
Q Did it come directly from Nationstar?
A Idon't know.
Q The note that is in -- the next page is
Nationstar 56. There is a note there that's been presented into the Court's record as Exhibit 2 as the copy of the original that was in the collateral file. Do you notice anything different between this note on the first page than the other notes we have already discussed?

A The photocopying is different.
Q How do you mean?
A It doesn't have a two-hole punch or a line.
Q There is also not an Old Republic stamp.
A That's correct.
Q Turning to this document we get to page \(60 . \mathrm{It}\) was articulated during the presentation of this document that this was actually the back of page 59 and there is an endorsement there, correct?
```

A Yes.
Q And that endorsement is in blank?
A Yes.
Q No one's name is written in?

```

A That's correct.
Q There's no white text box and there is a red circle that's around it?

A Well, I believe on the original the copy is not in color, so, yeah, that's correct. Although, I do object to the characterization of a text box. The copy I looked at had other lines. I don't know if that's a text box. It's a white spot. I don't know what it is. I am not testifying that there is a white text box on anything.

Q Okay. So there are differences with regards to this note that's in the collateral file and the note that was attached to the Amended Veritied Complaint?

A There are photocopying differences, yes. But the contents of the note are the same.

Q Well, the one that's atiached to the Amended Complaint doesn't have a circle around it?

A Correct. That is a photocopying difference. I don't know when a circle would have been added. It is still a blank endorsement. The circle does not affect the viability of the endorsement or have any impact on the endorsement.

Q When you attach an exhibit to a complaint, the purpose of doing so is a representation to the Court that it's a true and correct copy of the original, right?
```

    A No. That is a representation of our standing.
    I didn't say it was a true and correct copy of the
original. It's a copy of it. I am not testifying that
it's a true and correct copy. It's a copy that has the
relevant terms and conditions and facts about the case at
issue.
Q So you are of the opinion that when you attach
an exhibit to a complaint, it can be a copy of a copy of
a copy; it doesn't have to be a copy of the original?
A Well, it is a copy of the original. It's a copy
of a copy of the original.
Q Prior to filing the foreclosure in this case,
did you feel you needed to have the original in your
hands before the complaint was filed?
A No.
Q Why?
A It is not a requirement for the state of Nevada
to have the origimal note to prosecute a foreclosure.
Q Well, for the mediation program it is.
MR. STERN: I will object, Your Honor, that it
misstates the mediation rules and the statute.
MS. NEWBERRY: You are required to produce the
original or a certified copy of the original.
MR. STERN: That is correct
THE COURT: With that clarification, overruled.

```
        156
            THE WITNESS: For the mediation program, the
client has to certify that it is in possession of the
original and that what they are attaching is a true and
correct copy.
BY MS. NEWBERRY;
    Q But when you file the judicial foreclosure you
didn't have to have a true and correct copy?
    A Correct.
    Q Is it your understanding there was a motion for
summary judgment in the judicial foreclosure that took
place June 18, 2013?
    A Iknow there was a motion for summary judgment.
I do nof know when it took place.
    Q Are you aware of there being a presentation of
the original note at that hearing?
    A I was told there was one, yes.
    Q Who told you that?
    A Ibelieve it was Chris Hunter.
    Q In what time frame relative to that hearing were
you relayed that information?
    A I have no idea. Shortly thereafter I would
guess.
    Q. 1 will ask you to turn to page 60 , which is the
response to the verified Petition for Judicial Review
that you filed in this case.

A Page 60 is the endorsement.
Q I'm sorry. Exhibit 60.
THE COURT; Which is a standalone copy in my copy set.

THE WITNESS: I stop at 59.
THE COURT: There may not be a witness copy. I
have an extra.
MS. NEWBERRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I am handing the witness the Court's extra copy.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q This is the response to verified Petition for Judicial Review that your office filed, it appears to be on August 13th of 2013?

A Yes.
Q And I would ask you to look at the signature on that response. And whose signature is that?

A That's mine.
Q You signed this document and it was filed with the court with the exhibits that are attached?

A Yes.
Q Turn to Exhibit 1.
A Yes.
Q Looking at that document, it is the adjustable rate note with the Old Republic stamp on the front with
two hole punches, correct?
A Yes.
Q Why would you use this version when you have the original from the collateral file that was in your possession for nearly two months?

A Somebody made a mistake.
Q Who?
A Probably the associate pulling the exhibits.
Q Where did they pull the exhibits?
A Electronic files.
Q Similar discussion earlier today about this LPS imaging file system; is that the one you are referring to?

A We have our own electronic document system.
Q Okay. And just to acknowledge you looked at the endorsement on this, there is no red circle, correct or circle?

A No.
Q But you signed for the collateral file June 5 , 2013, two months before this was filed?

A I will take your word for it. I don't remember the date.

Q We just went through the Bailey letter that was dated June 5th. Sometime in the proximity of -

A Sometime around there, yes.
```

Q And you stated earlier the judicial foreclosure,

```
and I'm going to assume the response to be the same here,
but you felt that in filing your response to Petition for
Judicial Review a copy of a copy of a copy was
sufficient. Yon didn't have to actually get the original
and make a copy of it?

A I would have reconmended that we bring the original to court. This is just a copy for the purposes of attaching to a pleading. We would have brought the original to court hecause with a negotiable instrument that's the enforceable document, the actual negotiable instrument, that's why they are so valuable.

Q So you were in possession of it at that time and didn't make a copy of it. Instead, you used a version from the imaging file?

MR. STERN: Object as asked and answered.
THE COURT: Just for clarification purposes, overruled.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q You did not make copy of the original note that was in your possession in the collateral file. Instead, you used the version from the imaging system?

A Yes. Somebody pulled the one from the imaging system not the original.

Q Then on September 5,2013 , if you want to tum

1 to Exhibit 47, there is a document called Motion to Amend the Complaint that was filed by your office. And it appears to be your signature that signed for it?

A Yes.
Q And that was relative to the judicial foreclosure. This was the Second Amended Complaint that you were filing in that action and you attached an Exhibit Number 1. Again, the adjustable rate note with the Old Republic stamp with two hole punches on the front and a blank endorsement?

A Yes.
Q And that blank endorsement does not have a circle around it?

A Yes.
Q So you filed a second pleading in a different matter still using the imaging file?

A Yes.
Q At some point in time you were made aware of the fact that a version of the note was produced at mediation with a Nationstar stamp filled in to the bank endorsement, correct?

A Yes.
Q When did you become aware of that?
A I don't recall.
Q Was it before the October 2011 mediation or
162
after?

\section*{A I believe before.}

Q And what was your impression at that time of the characterization of the note that Nationstar was now the owner by endorsement?

A I don't think there's ever been a
characterization that Nationstar was the owner by endorsement.

Q Well, when the name is filled in on an endorsement what does it mean?

A It means they have the right to collect payment. But you are asking to draw a legal conclusion. It does not have anything to do with ownership.

Q Well, under the UCC, and you are an attorney and had to study commercial paper for the bar exam, what does it mean when a note has an endorsement in blank?

A It means the person that it's endorsed to has the right to collect payment.

Q But if it's not filled in how do you know who that is?

A The person that's in possession.
Q So blank endorsement anyone can pick up that note, fill in their name and collect on it?

MR. STERN: Objection, Your Honor, that misstates how a blank endorsement would work.

01/11/2014 02:39:50 PM
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    THE COURT: I think you need to rephrase,
    Ms. Newberry.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q When an endorsement is in blank and it isn't
specific -
THE COURT: Why don't you ask the question of
the witness what she thinks it is.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q What do you think a bank endorsement is?
MR. STERN: Your Honor, I'm going to object.
This is, first of all, opinion testimony. Ms.
Schuler-Hintz is definitely qualified to give it, but it
is not relevant. The UCC speaks for itself. And you are
the legal expert here none of us are.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: It means that the note is a
negotiable instrument. I'm not sure what you are asking.
It means that the note is a negotiable instrument and can
be freely transferred.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q And if the note is endorsed to a specific person
can that happen?
A If the note - can it be freely transferred?
Q If there's a name that specifies pay to the
order of Nationstar Mortgage, LLC, Bank of New York

```
Mellon, can they cash in on that note?
    A Well, it's their note, so regardless of that the
moncy would go to Nationstar and then Bank of New York
Mellon because that would be their agreement.
    Q. But who is entitled to enforce the note when
there is a name stamped on it rather than it being in
blank?
    A The party to whom it is stamped. That's what I
stated previously. They have the right to collect
payment.
    Q So there is a significant difference between an
endorsement in blank and an endorsement to an entity?
            MR. STERN: Objection, Your Honor, to the form
of the question, specifically what significant difference
means. Again, this is all set forth in the Uniformed
Commercial Code. We don't need any testmony on this.
            THE COURT: I appreciate it. But I do think it
is relevant to get this witness's opinion on this matter.
            THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Restate the question.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q There is a significant difference between an
endorsement in blank and endorsement to a specific
entity?
    A I don't know that it is a significant
difference. You have to take additional steps to
transfer the note, but it doesn't mean it can't be transferred. It means that particular party has the right to collect the payment and enforce it and they can change that at any time by the addition of another stamp.

Q So an endorsement in blank poses a question of who can enforce it because it doesn't specifically state who it is being endorsed to.

MR. STERN: Restate the objection. That discusses the UCC Rules, Your Honor. An endorsement in blank makes the instrument bearer of paper and anybody that possess it can enforce it.

THE COURT: I do not disagree with you. The Court obviously will be making the final determination on how all this is going to be played out.

But, Ms. Newberry, if you could, I appreciate this is not necessarily you called this witness someone that you are going to ask open-ended questions to, but rather than getting her to agree to your statements of what you think these things are, can you just ask her what her position is.

MS. NEWBERRY: I am trying to understand. She has testified that a copy of a copy of a copy is fine. I am trying to understand what her information and understanding is with regards to the meaning as it pertains to her possessing these documents and acting on
behalf of these clients what the difference is between a
blank endorsement and an endorsement to a specific entity.

MR. STERN: Let me just make it for the record, Your Honor. I'm sorry. Relevance objection to that.

THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I don't possess it for the purpose of enforcing it. I posses it for the purposes of acting as my client's attorney. So I am not sure what you are asking because we have very finite and discrete definitions of what we do.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Going back to the version of the note that we discussed for the Metlife signed certification for, you mentioned that that was the copy of the note at the time of the closing, and it didn't have an endorsement that was attached to it, right?

A Correct.
Q Is that because of the time of the closing it hadn't been endorsed yet?

A 1 don't know. I wasn't present at the closing.
Q Is that your understanding based upon handling thousands of foreclosures and documents over several years that when you get a copy from the title company it generally doesn't have that endorsement on it?

A No.
Q At some point in time an endorsement in this whole chain gets added to the title company's version of it. How did that happen?

A No. The endorsement gets added to the original note. And it can be added at any time after the note is originally signed by the borrower.

Q Right. With the original note. And you said you don't have to use an original, you can use a copy of a copy of a copy. The original note doesn't have the stamp of Old Republic Title on it. So in the version of the Old Republic Title stamp on the front cover of the note how does that endorsement page, the blank one and down the road, how did that get added to that document?

MR. STERN: I'm going to object, Your Honor, on the basis of foundation. The question assumes that the endorsement would be added to the version that Old Republic has, which is a copy. The objection is that it lacks foundation and the question does not make sense.

THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I don't know because I did not have possession or custody of the note at any time until it came to us in 2013, so I have no idea of when or how the endorsements were added.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:

Q But after June 5 th of 2013, when you received the collateral and you knew at that time that the endorsement had a red circle around it and that it didn't have the Old Republic stamp on the front, you still didn't think it was important to make a copy of it and use it in any of your future pleadings, that you could still use the other version of it with those other differences on that copy including the addition of a hanging endorsement?

A I don't think that's what I said. I said that somebody pulled a file copy. I didn't say I didn't think it was important to use a copy of the original.

Q I am trying to figure out at what point in time using the copy that you are relying on and showing as an exhibit in pleadings and standing and at foreclosure, that this endorsement was just added to what clearly was not the same instrument.

In other words, there wasn't a photocopy that was made that included the endorsement with the version that the title company had. Someone at some point added that endorsement page to the title company's version.

MR. STERN: I'm going to object, Your Honor. This lacks foundation and assumes that the copy that was used throughout and all of these different pleadings was the copy that the title company had and excludes the
```

possibility that, as Ms. Schuler-Hintz said, numerous copies. We also object on relevance. And this has been covered already. Asked and answered.
THE COURT: On the basis of the fact that this witness has already testified multiple times that she does not know how documents came the way they are, I am going to sustain the objection.
MS. NEWBERRY: I will move on, Your Honor. BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q Earlier today Lindsey Bennett-Morales testified that there is a foreclosure unit in your offices at McCarthy \& Holthus that deal with medjation?
A No. There is a mediation department at our offices that deal with mediation. We don't do nonjudicial foreclosures at McCarthy \& Holthus. Quality Loan Service trustee does that.
Q Who owns Quality Loan?
A Who owns Quality Loan?
Q McCarthy \& Holthus, correct?
A No. Kevin McCarthy and Thomas Holthus own Quality Loan.
Q Do you oversee any of the operations of the Quality Loan servicing office that is here in Las Vegas?
A There is no Quality Loan servicing office here in Las Vegas.

```

Q Where is their office located?
A San Diego.
Q Is there any part of your legal law firm office that is utilized by Quality Loan in Las Vegas?

A We are the attorneys for Quality Loan.
Q Relative to the October 2011 mediation that is the scope of the Petition here today, what did your office do to ensure that the documents presented at that mediation were true and correct, if anything?

A What did our office do to ensure the documents are true and correct?

Q Yes.
A We asked our client to provide these documents as required by the Foreclosure Mediation Rules and format required by the Foreclosure Mediation Rales.

Q And it requires that you obtain a copy of the original note and have it certified as being in the possession of whomever is issuing that certification?

A Correct.
Q And in this instance there was no certification
for the note?
A Correct.
Q Why?
A Nationstar was unable to locate the collateral file.
```

Q But your office presented the note at mediation that had the Nationstar stamp on it.
A We presented a copy that was given to us. We didn't certify it. It wasn't certified by Nationstar.
Q And in the Amended Complaint that was filed in the judicial foreclosure you included a copy of the note that didn't have the Old Republic stamp on the front and wasn't the same document that had been used in the prior mediation, and then later on in the filing in response to this PJR.
MS. STERN: Objection, Your Honor. This is asked and answered several times now. And we restate the other objection regarding relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained.

```

\section*{BY MS. NEWBERRY:}
```

Q On that document there is a white box. Did someone at your office erase the Nationstar Mortgage LLC stamp?
A No. Not to my knowledge.
Q Was it whited-out and added as an exhibit to the Complaint?
A Not to my knowledge.
Q In December of 2012, were you the managing partner at McCarthy \& Holthus?
A Yes.

```

\section*{Q And in October of 2011 were you the supervising} attorney?

A Yes.
Q Were you responsible for the attorneys and empinyees and staff with regard to their conduct acting on behalf of the law firm who is acting on belalf of the client?

A Yes.
Q What procedures do you have in place when errors are made or things are done incorrectly, like as you said, a mistake was made in pulling the exhibit?

A We will examine the file to determine how the mistake was made and then take steps to ensure it doesn't happen again.

Q So looking at the dates here, a copy from the Old Republic file was used ou six different occasions since the foreclosure started back in 2010.

A Recause we have 12/10-
Q The \(12 / 10\) mediation, the \(11 / 16\) document, that's the Old Republic note. \(10 / 16 / 11\), there is a Nationstar note that emerges with the Nationstar stamp. \(5 / 3 / 12\) you file a judicial foreclosure without an endorsement. 12/14/12 you file an Amended Complaint with the Old Republic Stamp wrong endorsement with a box somewhere near that endorsement.
And then again in the Motion to Amend the Complaint you
use the September 5, '13 that that note was used again.

What has to happen in this timeline to trigger a review of the file to ensure that the documents are correct?

\section*{A The documents are correct.}

Q How is anyone supposed to rely on six different versions of a note that has been produced at any given point in time?

MR. STERN: Objection, Your Honor.
Argumentative. We produced the original note in this.
THE COURT: Overruled. But 7 anticipate the witness can answer.

THE WITNESS: It's the same note. You are talking about variations in photocopying. The contents of the note are exactly the same whether it's stamped true and correct copy by the title company. If you compare it line by line to the original note it's the exact same note. It hasn't changed.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q I'm not talking about the text. I'm talking about the endorsement, which is, as you stated, the original note is so important to your client that you
have rigorous protocol for checking it in in your office and returning it to them. That endorsement in blank is serious with regards to letting it float about, correct?

A Correct.
Q Because an endorsement, as counsel testified, is bearer of paper, which means whoever possesses it can enforce it.

A I don't think counsel testified. I think I was testifying. But, yeah, it's bearer of paper. It is the same endorsement copy endorsed in blank on the original. It's endorsed in blank on each of the copies of the copics that are produced.

Q Except for the one your office produced at the October 2011 mediation, that one says Nationstar.

A And Nationstar has already testified that that was an error done by someone at their shop. We have the original note. The original note is endorsed in blank.

Q So all the documents up until this point shouldn't be considered or irrelevant?

MR. STERN: Objection again, Your Honor. Argumentative. I'm not sure what the -- that's one objection. I'm not sure what the second objection's title would be, but I think we've well established what McCarthy produced when and I think we are reaching the point of diminishing returns for this line of questioning
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and suggest that at this point badgering of the witness to go over the same old ground.

THE COURT: Overruled. You can answer this question.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. What was the question again?
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q The question was since you have the original today, all the other documents that have been produced are irrelevant?

A Yes. The original note is the operative document for enforcement purposes.

Q Rule 11 requires that an attomey do certain things when acting in front of a court; are you familiar we Rule 11?

A Yes.
Q Rule 11 requires that an attorney make a diligent effort to make certifications to the court about the true and correctness of the statements contained in any exhibits, records, documents. Supposed to be truthful and honest with the court.

MR. STERN: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I don't represent Ms. Schuler-Hintz, obviously, or McCarthy, but just on scope and relevance and the Rule 11 proceeding I do not think this is the proper time or
\[
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\section*{procedure to inquire about that.}

THE COURT: Can I have counsel at the bench.
(Off-the-record bench conference.)
THE COURT: The objection is overruled in terms of the questions being - the question can be restated and go from there.
BYMS. NEWBERRY:
Q Your understanding of Rule 1.1 is that you are making certifications to the court when you sign pleadings and enter them into the record that they are truthful and accurate to the best of your knowledge.

A Correct.
MS. NEWBERRY: I do not have any further
questions.
MR. STERN: I have a few questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Please.

\section*{CROSS-EXAMINATION}

BYMR. STERN:
Q Ms. Schuler-Hintz, we understand there were various copies of the note. We understand there is one copy with a blank endorsement with no circle around it, and the original has a red circle around it. Do you understand that?

A Yes.
```

    Q Based on your expcricncc, is it possible that
    the copy of the cndorsement without the red circle was
imaged before the red circle was added to the original?
A Yes.
Q In fact, is that likely that that is what
occurred here?
A Yes.
Q What impact, if any, does that have on the
validity of the endorsement?
A None.
Q Okay. And I just want to understand -
actually, it's not necessary.
That is all I have, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Ms. Newberry, any
further questions?
MS. NEWBERRY: I have nothing further, Your
Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Schuler-Hintz.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Ms. Newberry, any further witnesses?
MS. NEWBERRY: No further witncsses.
THE COURT: Mr. Stem, any further witnesses?
MR. STERN: I think we have a document we want
to offer as evidence. We are not going to be asking any
witnesses about it. It is a copy of Ms. Rodriguez'

```
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bankruptcy.
    THE COURT: Before we get to that, Ms.
Schuler-Hintz, did you have any witnesses that you wish
to call on behalf Bank of New York Mellon?
    MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: No, Your Honor.
    THE COURT: The exhibit you want to offer, is it
one that is in the binders?
    MR. STERN: It is not, Your Honor. We produced
it last night. What it is, Your Honor, is a copy of the
voluntarily Petition for Bankruptcy, as well as a copy of
the Discharge of Debtor Order pulled from Ms. Rodriguez'
bankruptcy.
    THE COURT: We still have to address the
documents 3 through 34 that were in the judicial notice
pile. And something like this would fall under that
category as it is obviously a file. I'm assuming it is a
file-stamped copy of a court document.
    MR. STERN: Correct.
    THE COURT: But what is the relevance in this
bankruptcy filing?
    MR. STERN: Two things, Your Honor. One is to
compare Ms. Rodriguez' testimony on November 1st with the
disclosures that were made in the bankruptey schedules.
We believe there are some inconsistencies we would like
to point out for the Court.

Secondly, it goes to the affordability of the
loan for Ms. Rodriguez. One of our defenses that was
previewed by Ms. Janati's testimony was that
Ms. Rodrigucz simply cannot afford this loan and that is
why the mediations have failed not as a result of any bad
faith. And the bankruptcy would be probative of that.
THE COURT: Were you unaware of this bankruptcy
when Ms. Rodriguez was testifying the last time?
MR. STERN: I personally was not aware of it. I
can't speak to previous counsel. We did not have these
documents. I don't intend to call Ms. Rodriguez again to
cross-examine her about it. I think it's useful for the
Court to have to compare the testimony.
THE COURT: We had the witness on the stand.
You are certainly entitled to call Ms. Rodriguez. I
don't know that the protocol of but if the documents that
we were going to put in are where we think all these
inconsistencies are is how we go about doing that. I
think you either put Ms. Rodriguez on the stand and ask
her some question, or not. But, again, you are welcome
to do that in your case in chief but I am concerned that
that was something that wasn't done previously.
Ms. Newberry.
MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, I would respond that
the bankruptcy discharge itself was produced with regards 180
to judicial foreclosure as an exhibit that was provided to them in our 16.1 disclosure relative to this action as well as that one. They were on notice of the bankruptcy at all three of the mediations because the bankruptcy was filed in 2008.

So at this point to bring it in for impeachment purposes for a witnesses that has already been excused is highly inappropriate.

THE COURT: If you wish to Call Ms. Rodriguez to the stand, Mr. Stern, you are welcome to do so. But I am not going to accept the document and the representations about what you believe the document shows and what you think what occurred at the time of the filing of that document and her testimony.

MR. STERN: Okay, I understand, Your Honor. I probably will recall her but only for that purpose. It shouldn't be very long.

THE COURT: You are welcome to do it. She is a
party. Is that what you are doing?
MR. STERN: Yes.
THE COURT: Ms. Rodriguez, can you please come up to the -

MR. STERN: I'm sorry. I did not realize they had rested.

THE COURT: You had rested, correct?
```

MS. NEWBERRY: Well, no, Your Honor. Actually,
we need to --
THE COURT: We will hear final argument.
MS. NEWBERRY: Well, we need to resolve the
issue with regard to the documents.
THE COURT: Well, then that as well.
MS. NEWBERRY: Okay.
THE COURT: Ms, Rodriguez, come on up and we
will re-swear you again since it's obviously been some
period of time.
Whereupon,
CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ,
was administered the following oath by the court clerk.
THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear that the
testimony you give in this action shall be the truth, the
whole truth, and nothing but the truth so help you God.
THE WITNESS: I do.
THE CLERK: Please state and spell your full
name for the record.
THE WITNESS: Catherine Rodriguez.
C-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-e, R-o-d-r-i-g-u-e-z.
THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Rodriguez.
Mr. Stem.
MR. STERN: Your Honor, may I approach the
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witness?
    THE COURT: You may.
    Now, obviously, my intention, Mr. Stem, is not
to have you question her about what's in the document by
looking at the document. My interation was to have you
question her on whatever information it is that you think
you can now impeach her prior testimony with, let her
testify, and if she can't recall something then you can
refresh her recollection with it. But this is not to put
her up to testify about a document that the Court is not
otherwise accepting.
MR. STERN: Understood, Your Honor.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BYMR. STERN:
    Q Ms. Rodriguez, I would like to first of all ask
you do you recall testifying here on November 1 ?
    A Yes.
    Q Is the testimony you gave on November Ist true
and correct?
    A To what I remember, yes.
    Q I would like to draw your attention - well, let
me ask you this. Do you recall giving testimony about
your bankruptcy?
    A Yes, I do.
```

Q Do you recall testifying that you bad student
loans at about 12 or \$13,000?
A Yes.
Q Do you recall being asked about credit card
debt?
A Credit card debt?
Q Credit card debt.
A I don't remember. You asked me about debt, I
don't know if it was specific.
Q Okay. Do you recall what credit card debt you had discharged in your bankruptcy?
A I have no idea.
Q Was it more than $\$ 2,000$ ?
A I don't remember.
Q I would like to ask you, Ms. Rodriguez, do you recall in your bankruptcy what the amount of debt was discharged in that bankruptcy?
A I have no clue. It has been too long ago. I have not looked at it.
Q So ifI represent to you $\$ 92,000$ was discharged, would that seem correct?
A Huh?
Q If I represented to you that it was approximately $\$ 92,000$, would that seem correct?
A I have no clue. I don't remember.
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may, Your Honor, refresh her recollection with our exhibits.

THE COURT: You may.
BYMR. STERN:
Q Ms. Rodriguez, if you could turn to the exhibit that \(I\) just provided to you, and I apologize in advance because these are not Bates numbered.

If you would turn to the page at the top of the bankruptcy petition that has page 8 of 39 at the very
top.
A Page 8 you said?
Q Yes.
A Yes.
Q It you could turn to the next page which says page 9.

A Yes.
Q Do you see at the very bottom it says total of nonpriority unsecured debt, and do you see there is a number next to it?

A 92,725.
Q Does that help you to refresh your recollection as to how much was in your bankruptcy?

\footnotetext{
A No, not at all.
Q That doesn't?
}

A No, nothing.
MR. STERN: And I have no more questions for
you.
THE COURT: All right.
Ms. Newberry, anything to follow-up on?
MS. NEWBERRY: Just to clarify.

\section*{CROSS-EXAMINATION}

BY MS. NEWBERRY:
Q You had an attomey that assisted you in your bankruptcy in 2008, correct?

A Correct.
Q Did your bankruptcy attorney explain to you at any point in time what the total amount of debt that was being discharged?

A No.
Q Did the bankruptcy trustee that examined you at your 341 hearing explain to you what the total amount of debt being discharged was?

A No.
Q When you provided a list of creditors to your attorney did you include not only the original creditors but any debt collectors that had surfaced after you found yourself in a position of filing bankruptoy?

A I am not understanding. Sorry.
```

    Q Were there any debt collectors that were sending
    you notices trying to collect payment other than the
original creditor that you had any debts with?
A I don't remember. I don't recall.
Q When you went to see your attorney did he pull a
credit report for you?
A I believe I did.
Q Did that information on that credit report was
that what was used to help fill out your bankruptcy
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schedule?
    A I believe that is how they do it.
    MS. NEWBERRY: Nothing further, Your Honor.
    THE COURT: Anything further?
    MR. S'TERN: Nothing further.
    THE COURT: Ms. Rodriguez, you are excused.
    Go ahead, Mr. Stern.
    MR. STERN: Understand Your Honor's position on
the admission of the document, as we would offer it in
evidence again.

THE COURT: What is your position, Ms. Newberry, to this document? My clerk just pointed out that it was listed on the exhibit list as a proposed 61 or 62 .

MR. STERN: I think we have it as both; 61 is the Petition, 62 is the Order of Discharge.

THE COURT: And you have enough copies to
```

provide. Ms. Newberry, what's your position?
MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, bankruptcy petition
is available on Pacer (phonetic). It is certainly
acceptable on a public record. I don't have an objection
based on the one being filed being authentic. As far as
characterization that the bankruptcy petition and
schedules in any way impeaches my client's testimony, I
think it is an improper stretch with regard to not only
what the testimony was, but even my client's basic
understanding of what the bankruptcy petition schedules
are.
THE COURT: All right. I appreciate that. I will good ahead and allow the admission of the document as Exhibits 61 and 62 . I am also going to allow the admission of documents 3 through 34, as previously discussed, as records that are part of the public records and various filings, and the Court will be able to take judicial notice of their existence.
Again, whatever weight to be given to them and their relevant importance of this case, if not the relevancy themselves, will be weighed and determined by the Court as it reviews the record. But I will allow the documents to be entered.
I will, however, allow counsel an opportunity to make a record if you have any particular documents within
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that range that you want to specifically object to.
MR. STERN: Your Honor, the exhibit list -
THE COURT: You will need to approach the clerk and provide them.

MR. STERN: Yes. Your Honor, we would object on
relevance grounds to Exhibits \(14,15,16,17,18\). We
agree to admit 19. 20 , we object to. 21 , we object to.
22 , we do not object to. 23 , we object to. 24 , we
object to. 25 , we object to. 26 , we object to. 27 , we
object to. 28 , we object to. \(29,30,31,32,33\) and 34
we object to all. All objections are relevance
objections.
THE COURT: Now, can I see that the first set of documents that you objected to are First Horizon related documents. I can understand the other objections throughout with regard to Metlife or other entities that predate these relevant entities, but I am not sure 1 see the basis for the objection to starting at 25 when we've got documents related to Bank of New York Mellon and documents related to Nationstar. What are the basis for arguing those are irrelevant?

MR. STERN: Because they have nothing to do with any of the issues in the case. They are annual reports. They do not speak to what happened with Ms. Rodriguez' loan specifically, nor do they speak to any policy and
procedures. They are, I think, used to attempt to show that Nationstar has a lot of moncy to then predict punitive award, which we believe is not appropriate in a PJR, and in any event, are not probative to anything.

So we don't dispute the authenticity nor the fact that they relate to the parties before you, but not the issues.

THE COURT: And, again, the Court has already deemed to admit them based on the fact that they are available public records and authentication is not an issue. And the Court will weigh the relevancy of them. But on the same basis that documents were allowed through the course of the witness testimony that Ms. Newberry argued are relevant to the idea in terms of what might have been the motivation of financial gain of Nationstar in pursuing the foreclose the way that it did, Ill allow these matters on that basis as well.

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, for preservation of the record, I would like to comment on the other documents mentioned.

THE COURT: You may.
MS. NEWBERRY: With regards to Exhibits 20 and
21, those are documents that Bank of New York Mellon is
a party to, including the - I'm sorry. The First
Horizon assets security which is \(14,15,16,17\) and 18 .
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Those all have to do with the securitization of this loan. Bank of New York Mellon was a party to that transaction. They have been the trustee since the inception of the loan securitization. They have remained the owner of the note since they received it according to their own documents in 2005 and were behind the scene throughout the foreclosure of this file, which led us here today.

THE COURT: Anything you would like to add to the record, Mr. Stern?

MR. STERN: Yes, Your Honor. I reiterate the fact that parties to this case are parties to these agreements doesn't make the agreements relevant. Moreover, these agreements are registration statements before the Securities and Exchange Commission. They are very high-level disclosures that you have to drill down considerably before you get to the loan level issue such as a loan we have here. So that's the basis of the relevance objection. They just don't show anything that should really influence you. But we understand your point that they are coming in but that we can argue for how much weight you should give them. For a complete record, that is our objection.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate that.
My intent was to allow both sides to make
```

summation, if you want to call it that, or at least some
summary arguments of what the evidence that has been put
forward should tell the Court and dictate the Court to
do. And if you need a few minutes to gather your
thoughts about that or are you ready to go because I
would be happy to continue if that would interrupt your
flow.
MS. NEWBERRY: I believe we would like a break,
Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let me give you five minutes to
gather your thoughts and take a quick break.
MS. NEWBERRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Why don't you proceed.
MR. STERN:Thank you, Your Honor.
Appreciate the time, patience and effort you
have given us all as we presented our respective
positions in this case. We believe the evidence shows
that there is no basis for a significant sanction in this
case.
We have here a foreclosure mediation conducted
pursuant to the Foreclosure Mediation Program. We
understand, I think all of us, the document production
obligations, including the obligation to provide a
certified copy of the note, deed of trust and the
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assignment. And we recognize that this case, in fact we
testified that a certification was not provided at the
mediation in October of 2011.
    We are also familiar with the Supreme Court's
jurisprudence, however, we believe that the petitioner,
Ms. Rodriguez, attempts to use this process for a
significantly more punitive end than for the Court to
review what happened at the mediation and to determine
what sanctions are appropriate.

And we start with the testimony presented. We started with Ms. Rodriguez' testimony, which began with a history of her loan going back to 2005 and her interaction with First Horizon Home Loans, as well as the testimony with regard to Metlife and the mediation conducted by Metlife.

Your Honor, none of that should have any bearing on your decision. Those mediations were not conducted by Nationstar. They were not attended by a Nationstar representative. None of the document issues, if any, should be looked at. You should look to Nationstar to address any document deficiency, if any. The correct party for that would be Metlife. The party that is not before the Court.

Moreover, Your Honor, there was a Petition for Judicial Review that Metlife and BONY filed -- this was
back when Judge Mosley was handling these petitions and any claims that Ms. Rodriguez had arising out of that should have been addressed in that proceeding.

So this is all a way of saying, Your Honor, that this attempt to present the life of the loan including two mediations by servicers who weren't before the Court do not justify a sanction against Nationstar. A party that had absolutely no comnection to the loan until August of 2011.

So we get to August of 2011, and as Ms. Janati testified back on November Ist, in August of 2011 Nationstar acquired the servicing rights not only for Ms. Rodriguez' loan but for a significant number of other loans. I believe she didn't know the exact number but the term she used in her testimony last month was thousands.

Ms. Janati, at that point explained the means by which Nationstar ensures the integrity of the custodial process on original documents. She testified that after origination is closed the originals are stored with the document custodian. Now, a document custodian, she did not say this, but as part of the legal ramifications of the facts she gave a document custodian is an agent. And agency law pervades the Uniform Commercial Code in mortgages, particularly in the enforcement of loans.

Nationstar itself is an agent. Nationstar is an agent of the owner of the note, BONY, and it uses an agent. In this case, Ms. Janati testified US Bank is the custodian of the note.

The original note was in custody by a document custodian. In other words, it's an agent designated to keep custody of the document until it was released to Ms. Schuler-Hintz' firm. And Ms. Janati testified there was no gap in the integrity of that process, the guardianship of the original note.

We asked her about the version of the note that was presented at mediation, and here we are talking about the mediation that took place in October of 2011, two months after Nationstar acquired servicing rights.

Ms. Janati explained that the affixation of the Nationstar stamp was made in error. She testified and explained that there was no policy or procedure on the part of Nationstar to materially change notes. She testified that in this particular case while there was obviously a change, and we don't dispute that there was a change made by somebody at Nationstar, Ms. Janati explained that this was made to a copy, a copy of the note. She explained in her investigation she was unable to determine who was responsible for that or what the reason was, but she did also explain to the Court that
the - I believe she was questioned about this by
Ms. Newberry -- that the affixation of the Nationstar
stamp did not affect the borrower at all and we believe
that is an important point.

And two reasons why it did not impact the borrower. As I asked Ms. Janati on redirect, Nationstar did not change any particular offer or consideration of a loan modification at the mediation as a result of presenting a note -- a copy, I should say, a copy of a note with the Nationstar stamp placed on it.

And I think what the petitioner was suggesting and took on other questions that drew quite a bit of objections was that by presenting the note, the copy of the note with the stamp, Nationstar was taking the position that it actually owned the note. And I believe there was some testimony that an employee of Nationstar by the name of Daniel Marks, which confused me at first because I thought we were talking about the attorney,

The statement which Mr. Marks allegedly made, you know, assuming it is not hearsay and we did not object to it as hearsay because we seemed to find it to be a part statement, but even if this statement was in fact made and Ms. Janati confirmed that it would not be correct. Nationstar never claimed ownership in this proceeding. And she confirmed otherwise.

\section*{copy does not change that at all. And the reason it} doesn't do that is because it was done on a copy. And I think we have explained our position in regard, Your Honor, which is it's the original that matters. The original is -- and this is an important point as well. If Nationstar had in fact affixed a copy of the original, which did not happen, the impact on Ms. Rodriguez would be nil. It would be zero. That could potentially create a problem between Nationstar and BONY potentially. But it would not impact Ms. Rodriguez at all. She would still be under the Uniformed Commercial Code obligated to pay the obligation to Nationstar even if BONY has a claim potentially against Nationstar that does not impact the promissor or the promissory.

So the impact, again, is nothing. There is no harm to Ms. Rodriguez coming out of that even if it had been done on an original, but it wasn't.

The second point is that if it had been done on an original and it was subsequently discovered that it was done incorrectly, as Ms. Janati explained, it never should have been placed, the Nationstar stamp, nothing would have prevented Nationstar from affixing a new endorsement back to blark, converting to special endorsement. Again, if it were a blank endorsement then
it would be bearer of paper.
So the fact that this happened on a copy of the note coupled with the fact that even if it happened with an original note that it would have been regretful and then in either circumstance the impact on the borrower is zero militates very strongly against using this case as a vehicle penalized Nationstar for alleged improprieties or irregularities of custody and document handling.

The Court's attention should be focused only on what happened at the mediation. What happened at the mediation is that Nationstar appeared. We understand that there was a two-month contimuance, but we argued to the Court that even a two-month continuance, while it might sound generous, while you are boarding thousands and thousands of loans, it's not a long time to get up to speed to engage in significant and meaningful loss mitigation and home retention alternative for the borrower.

As I believe Ms. Schuler-Hinz, or maybe it was Ms. Bennett-Morales that explained there really was no options moving this mediation any further. And so Nationstar appeared at the mediation. We understand that there was the problematic copy of the note. But a very significant point is that it was not certified as a true and correct copy.

And I believe there was some testimony on a suggestion from somebody internally at Nationstar about executing a certification in the anticipation that the original would be found in time. That was never done. And so the Court weighed -- the weight that you should ascribe to that testimony is nothing, Your Honor, because it didn't happen.

When all of was said and done Nationstar made through its counsel, made the election to appear at mediation without a document certification because of the inability to confirm it.

Now, we understand the Supreme Court's jurisprudence on this and we believe that there should be no sanction, or if there is a sanction for that document issue, it should be no different than the sanctions issued in other cases where a lender, through its servicer, I should say servicer, appeared at mediation. Mediates in good faith. Discusses loss mitigation and other foreclosure and home retention alternatives with borrower and cannot place a borrower in a performing mediation not because of any imperfection in the process, but rather because the borrower simply cannot afford a modification. And that's sometimes unfortunately the case.

Now, as Ms. Janati said, the goal of the
servicer and the investor is home retention. The company, contrary to popular belief, or things you see in the media, a mortgage service and it's client, the owner and the investor in the note, do not make money when there is a foreclosure. We lose money. They lose money. And for that reason, Nationstar takes the Foreclosure Mediation Program seriously and has attempted in this particular case to work with Ms. Rodriguez to put her in a performing modification.

The problem here is that Ms. Rodriguez cannot afford this home. We have been through three mediations. Ms. Rodriguez testified that she has not made a payment, I believe it was approximately five years.

In addition to that, she admitted it was a significant benefit to her and her family that she was living in the residence without paying for it. Apart from the monthly mortgage payment there is also the taxes and insurance that Nationstar is carrying. All of those expenses, Your Honor, are significant because Ms. Rodriguez testified that she needs her payment to be \(\$ 600\) a month. That's what she would like. She stated later that she could maybe go up to a thousand dollars, but we suggest the fact that she has been paying a monthly retainer to the attorneys in the amount of \(\$ 600\) shows that that's about what she can afford.

And even as Ms. Janati said, if we were to put this loan at two percent rate, her debt to income ratio would still be 86 percent, which means that after the debt is paid for every dollar she earns she would only have 14 cents left. 86 cents would go to the debt. And that's hallmark of a loan that the borrower cannot afford.

Unfortunately, not every mediation results in a workable modification. And not in every case the borrower can retain the home they want. That, I think, is what we are dealing with. That is why the mediations did not result in any successful modification because in order to modify the loan and make it affordable Nationstar would have been required to cut principle significantly. And there is nothing in the mediation rules or in any of the Supreme Court's jurisprudence or statutes that obligates Nationstar to force a reduction in principle.

So what we have here, Your Honor, is a situation where Nationstar appeared at a mediation. It negotiated in good faith. It explored alternatives. The parties could not come to terms because Ms. Rodriguez required a significant reduction in principle in order to accomplish the objective that it wanted and Nationstar was not willing to give that. That is a failed mediation and it
is unfortunate, but it is not sanctionable.
The only issue here that puts us outside - and the reason that a foreclosure certificate did not issue is the document situation. Understanding the Supreme Court's jurisprudence, we ask that you consider all of these factors. The fact that Nationstar was a newcomer to the game, so to speak, having been servicing the loan for only two months. The fact that despite that it attended the mediation knowing full well, and I think McCarthy \& Holthus' efforts to inform Ms. Newberry and her team that we were not going to have the documents speak to that good faith.

We went to the mediation regardless and declined to sign a certification of the documents because there had not been an opportunity to compare. And we suggested, Your Honor, if there had been an opportunity to compare and execute the certification as would have happened if this mediation would have taken place a little later, we probably would have avoided that problem with the stamp because somebody would have noticed, Hey, wait a minute. This is endorsed in blank. Why is this copy not especially endorsed to Nationstar. Certainly McCarthy \& Holthus would have noticed it.

So if the Court is inclined to give a sanction here, Your Honor, we strongly recommend that the Court
look at all the factors the Supreme Court has announced and treat this case no different than any other case where lender appears but just does not have one of the documents or doesn't certify one of the documents. This case is no different.

The fact that we have an endorsement with a problematic stamp from Nationstar -- excuse me -- to Nationstar does not change that. And, again, the reason it doesn't change it is because a couple of reasons. First of all, we never certified the note. If we had certified that note as a true and correct copy then we would have, I think, a significant problem. Here we have a copy that was produced but it was not certified as a true and correct copy.

Secondly, Your Honor, there was an assignment produced to BONY. And as Ms. Janati testified, BONY is the owner of this loan and Nationstar acquired the servicing rights. So Nationstar appeared as the representative of the investor. And with the deed of trust having been assigned to the investor on whose behalf Nationstar appeared, the note does not matter because the Supreme Court's jurisprudence has made clear a note, an interest in the note, may be transferred by assignment and deed of trust. So that's what happened here.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
And that leads us to the standing issue, Your \\
2 Honor. There was no defect in standing. And, again, because of the deed of trust that was produced, and we've shown you a copy, actually the original note, and we have accounted for its custody and possession demonstrating that Nationstar as the agent, through its own agent, US Bank, has custody of the note. The note is endorsed in blank giving Nationstar the ability to enforce it. That's clear from the evidence we presented to you regardless of what happened at the mediation itself. There is no question that Nationstar is the right party. \\
In some of the testimony that was presented, Your Honor, there was some back and forth with Ms. Janati on the incentives that Nationstar allegedly has to foreclose. Ms. Janati explained that the company does not make a profit from foreclosure. The documents, and we invite the Court to review those carefully, as we are all sure you will, those documents speak of servicing advances. \\
As Ms. Janati explained, those are costs that the servicer has to bear; paying attomeys' fees, recording fees, things of that nature, where the servicer is out of pocket. That is no different, Your Honor, than for example, a plaintiffs attorney advancing expenses on behalf of a client and then where there is a payout \\
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\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
1 based policy preferring foreclosure, which we would submit, again, that evidence does not support it. \\
There was also an attempt to attack the relationships between Nationstar and its attomey as sloppy, as not following procedures. Your Honor, that is simply not a basis for a sanction or a punitive award. \\
The relationship between Nationstar and its counsel is between Nationstar and its counsel. If Nationstar has policies and procedures that are not followed, and by the way, the plaintiffs did not present any evidence that the policies and procedures were not followed. In fact, they didn't even establish that the policies in 2013 were signed by McCarthy \& Holthus. But even if we assumed that they met the hurdle, that is an issue between Nationstar and McCarthy \& Holthus. That is not an issue that really impacts Ms. Rodriguez. \\
Again, Ms. Rodriguez is impacted by two documents; the note and the deed of trust. And there is no question after two days of this that Nationstar has possession of the original. That it is endorsed in blank. Yes, it has a red circle on it. All that means is somebody made a red circle around it after the copy was made. It does not mean that the endorsement isn't valid. Doesn't mean anything. Certainly, there was no evidence presented and no legal authority cited that it
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
recouping those expenses. Doesn't mean that the plaintiff's attomey paid for an expert or paid the filing fees. It makes a profit when they recover those costs. They are just basically covering costs. \\
Ms. Janati contradirted and rejected the theory here and presented that Nationstar has a profit motive not to mediate in good faith. And the documents, certainly, simply because Nationstar is a profit company that recovers costs of this nature does not mean that it has a financial incentive. There was no proof of that here. We argue that the documents that were presented for that objective. We do not say what the plaintiff suggested that they say. \\
And, finally, Your Honor, we come back to the point here that not only did Nationstar have standing and not only did Nationstar have al interest in home retention, there is a strong policy on the part of the Supreme Court through its rules to use these forums, forum, as a vehicle to discover what it is that happened at a mediation and to determine whether sanctions are appropriate or not, that is a very case-by-case inquiry, Your Honor. We submit that needs to account for the particular circumstances of each mediation. \\
There was testimony and argument presented on the part of the petitioner that Nationstar has a broadly
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
should matter at all. \\
Again, Your Honor, you have here what we would argue is a pretty common situation; a lender attended a mediation but it did not have all the documents. And that does not support using this judicial proceeding, this judicial review proceeding, whose purpose is only to look at what happened in this case, as a vehicle to award punitive damages against Nationstar either in this case or things that it may be doing that impact other cases. \\
There has been no testimony and no evidence presented about Nationstar doing anything in a loan outside of Ms. Rodriguez'. Any such evidence is purely speculation on that and suggestion. There is no such evidence presented, and it would be improper to present such evidence for the Court to consider because this is not a proceeding to assign punitive awards. We believe that is what the petitioner wants to do by presenting to the Court reports showing how much money this company makes. \\
This is not a situation for a punitive award, and don't believe the statute or rules even contemplate that. It is within the Court's discretion to tailor the sanction, if it is a sanction, to the circumstances here. And we would, finally, Your Honor, in closing point out that Ms. Rodriguez admitted that she has
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
benefitted tremendously from being able to live in a home for five years without paying for it. \\
If the Court does isste a sanction and if the sanction is payable to Ms. Rodriguez personally we would ask that the Court make the sanction payable as a setoff to the significant arrears that Ms. Rodriguez has already accumulated. That would help her by reducing the debt that she owes and it would accomplish the purpose of sanctions because it would be a liability that Nationstar would incur. \\
And in conclusion, if the Court does issue a sanction for the failure to have the certified documents at the mediation, it should be in line with other situations of that nature where the sanction is maybe a couple thousand dollars. Thank you, Your Honor. \\
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Stern. \\
Ms. Schuler-Hintz, did you want to make some closing remarks? \\
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Yes, Your Honor. I will be very brief. \\
Mr. Stern said that this a common situation. \\
It's not actually a common situation because Ms. \\
Bennett-Morales prior to the mediation specifically told Ms. Newberry that we did not have and could not get the promissory note. \\
When we went in to the mediation we all knew there was no certified note. We have no option once mediation is elected if you discover the promissory note has been lost, destroyed, shipped by Fed-Ex to another site than where it was supposed in he, which has actually happened to me, you don't have any option. You still have to mediate unless the mediator continues it. \\
It is the only program I know where your only option is to go in and sit down and say, I told you I couldn't get it. Sanction me. You are stuck with what you have at the time of the mediation based on what the mediator does. \\
So we went to mediation in good faith. And the Supreme Court has repeatedly said, Good faith is going in and trying to resolve the situation. Documents do not equal good faith. Documents equal standing to foreclose to let the person know they are in the room with the right party and to provide them with assurances that they are with the people they can be with. \\
Well, in this case, we went in. We had the right person. We had the servicer and Nationstar had the power to offer the modification that they offered. They in fact tried to offer a modification. They tried to work it out. We mediated in good faith. Failing to have a certified copy of the note is not equal to bad faith.
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Walking in, folding your arms and saying, I \\
don't have to give you anything. I don't like you. \\
That's bad faith. Admitting prior to the mediation, We don't certify it. We can't certify it. We don't have it, but we're here to try anyway, that is good faith. We went in. We tried. \\
They required us to be there. We did everything we could. The best evidence rule requires when you need it you produce the best evidence. That is the original promissory note. What was attached to the pleading, that's not evidence. That's why we have discovery. \\
Those are informative documents. \\
Could things have been handled better? In retrospect, absolutely they could always be handled better. Was Ms. Rodriguez harmed by anything that occurred two years ago? She was not. Because at that time she could not afford the modification. As a matter of fact, she may have been helped because if her financial situation has been improved she may actually been able to afford a modification now if she elects to be reviewed for one. \\
We have seen in this court time and time again where the time delay, because my clients couldn't get their act together, has actually assisted people in getting their lives back on track by giving them the \\
necessary time to increase their income and improve their situation. \\
Your Honor, I don't think that any sanction is appropriate here other than the sanction that's available for failing to bring a certified copy of the note because that is the exact failure that exists. There was a failure to bring the certified copy of the note to the mediation two years ago. A fact that Ms. Newberry and Ms. Rodriguez were aware of for the last two years. Thank you. \\
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. \\
Ms. Newberry, final word. \\
MS. NEWBERRY: In September counsel for \\
Nationstar/Bank of New York Mellon actually couched and phrased what this Petition is about. Why? Counsel for Nationstar said, Why? Why would we put that stamp on it? Why would we do that? That doesn't make sense. Why would we do that? \\
And I thought heavily after we left the hearing, Yeah, why? That's why we're here. Why won't they offer a modification? Why won't they review? Why are they producing all of these questionable documents, admittedly forged documents. Why are they doing all of this? \\
There is an old fable in India about five blind men that walk into a room. And they are asked to touch
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
trunk and says, I found a snake. Another one touches the
leg and says, \(\mathrm{Oh}, \mathrm{I}\) found a pillar; this must be a tree.
Someone else touches the tail and says, No, no, no. It's
definitely a rope. And then another one touches the
center and says, Oh no. This is a brick wall. When the
lights are turned on it's a big elephant.

The analogy is Bank of New York Mellon at the very beginning of the foreclosure activity is the elephant in the room. They were the ones that were making the fees. They were making the money, and they were hiring all of the different servicers, who in turn were delegated the authority to hire the law firm who represented them at all of these different mediations.

Conveniently, they want you to consider only the tail. This is just a rope. It's just one mistake. Don't look at the elephant. There has been no evidence that there's a pattern of practice. There is no evidence.

They are trying to boil this down to the only thing they have, which is oops. They have been caught with their hand in the cookie jar. They forged a document. They repeatedly filed inaccurate documents and when it is brought to their attention, oh, well, it's okay. Because it's horseshoes and hand grenades, and
\[
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\]
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when we take people's houses as long as it's close enough it's okay. Well, it's not okay. And the Supreme Court has repeatedly said that it's not okay.

We have a statute in 107 that says you must bring the original or a certified copy of the original. Not whichever version is the most expedient or cost effective. So why? The why here, Your Honor, is the bottom line. The bottom line for the foreclosure firms, the bottom line for the servicers, and the bottom line for who ultimately is the owner in this case, Bank of New York Mellon.

There has been a lot of evidence and a lot of documents put in, and I appreciate the Court's indulgence in allowing all of that information in because the only way for us to see the elephant is to look at the motivation for why. Is it really about Catherine Rodriguez not keeping her home? Absolutely not. It's not about that. That's way to much attention to a specific loan file in detail for this large of an organization to have. So we have to look at, okay, what motivates them to look at loss mitigation. What motivates them to show up at mediation and work with a particular homeowner? 1 s it because every single individual loan is their focus? No. It's because they have policies and procedures and there are financial

1 in
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incentives that guide how they handle a default.
Up until this point, every single person in representation of the bank has told you that the custodian of this file is US Bank. It's not. I know their documents. I know their file better than they do and it's their case, its their documents.

I will direct you to a series of exhibits, understanding you won't be able to keep up with me as I flip through them, but I want the record to reflect how the chain of events really pans out in regards to your understanding of not just why this loan modification wasn't offered, but why did they force the document, why did they continue to make these representations.

And contrary to Mr. Stern's representation, we are not asking you to sanction Nationstar; we are asking you to sanction all of them because they are all culpable.

Bank of New York Mellon is responsible for what First Horizon did. They are culpable for what Metlife did. And they're culpable for what Nationstar did. Because they are agents. We stipulated to agency. We are asking for sanctions against Bank of New York Mellon. Now, if Nationstar has to write the check, that's not my problem. That's not your problem. It's who is responsible in this case. Ulitimately, it's Bank of New 214

\section*{York Mellon.}

In the Pooling and Servicing Agreement, which is Exhibit 19 on page 138, it says "Form of subsequent certification of the custodian." This is the Pooling and Servicing Agreement they stipulated to that created the relationship with Bank of New York Mellon and my client's loan.

The custodial agreement dated May 27, 2005, by and among the Bank of New York Mellon, as trustee; First Horizon as the servicer, and First Tennessee Bank as the custodian. In accordance with Section 3, the above caption custodial agreement, the undersigned as custodian hereby certifies as to each mortgage loan listed in the mortgage loan schedule. My client's loan is listed in that schedule.

They don't even know where these documents are coming from or who has them, yet they made repeated representations at all three mediations, Bank of New York Mellon. Metlife filed a Petition for Judicial Review saying they are the beneficiary. It says it in the document filed with the Court. Metlife, we own the loan. No, you don't. You own the servicing rights. Bank of New York Mellon owns the loan on behalf of the certificate trust series based on all of these documents filed with the SEC. Why are all these documents filed
```

with the SEC? They are complicated. They are 900 pages.
You have four binders of this stuff. An average attorney
has a hard time reading it to figure it out.
Why are they required to publish this information, because the investors have an obligation and a duty to look at what they are investing their money in to and what the terms are and how people get paid and what their benefits and their proceeds are.
US Bank has never been involved with this loan. They all said that that was the custodian. But according to their own docunents and records, it's First Tennessee. So that's one discrepancy I think highlights their entire point here is, they themselves, and when I am talking about "they" I am saying McCarthy \& Holthus as the attorneys representing at the mediation, Nationstar at the servicing level, and Quality Loan who initiated the foreclose, they all touched the elephant based on the tail, a leg and a trunk. They can't even see the elephant in the room. They don't even know where these documents come from.
How are they articulating to the Court and making a representation, trust us, Judge, because today we brought the original. Everything else doesn't matter. Well, what about the cases where they don't have to produce the original. How can we rely on the validity of

```
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\section*{that foreclosure action, whether it ends up being} judicial or nonjudicial.

Ms. Schuler-Hintz recommended that we get additional time because once they get notified of the mediation there is just not enough time to locate all these documents. Why are they filing a foreclosure if they don't have them in the first place. Wouldn't that be the first thing that an entity looking to enforce an agreement would do is to check to make sure that we have it.

Because in a nonjudicial state they have been allowed, and when I say "they" I mean the foreclosure entities, from the trustee to the law firm to the servicer. They have been on the honor system. We're doing it because we have the right to do it and we have all the documents. We promise. File all these documents. Post them on people's property and kick them out of their houses. 90 times they might be dead on right, did it all correctly and have the backing and all of the documents in place. But is it okay that the other ten people who they may have wrongfully foreclosed on and didn't have the documents in place or something else, is it okay for them to lose their house because, hey, 90 percent is pretty good. That's what they are relaying to you in that, No, we don't have these documents, and we
get them when they elect mediation. Because if they don't elect mediation why should we spend money and the time and the effort to go all the way back to look at that custodial file.

They are looking at imaging records from 2005. That note based on the pooling and servicing agreement, could have been sold. It could have been swapped out. And First Horizon could have been forced to buy it back. There are all kinds of provisions buried in these documentations with regards to that loan could potentially go somewhere else. If they don't go get the custodial file and they are relying on the image -they've never seen the lien. They could be producing not only a document that's inaccurate and fraudulent, they may be taking action on a property that they don't have any title to whatsoever.

The system allows them to shortcut bringing the original by making a certified copy of the original and producing at mediation. They have admitted, We didn't do that. Not only did we not do that we brought one that we simply made up. But it was an accident. We didn't mean to. Well, then, why did they do it.

And that gets into why did Nationstar do this. Why does Nationstar continue to say there are no retention options for you. Ms. Janati testified that the 218
investors lose a lot of money. That's about the only thing I think I agree on with regard to her understanding of the foreclosure process and the proceeds that are gamered from. The investors do lose, they lose heavily. And the vast majority of the investors in these securitized loans are public employee retirement systems, unions, people that buy into the certificate series itself without really any understanding in what they are investing their money into in hopes that they are going to get a return based on Wall Street and the predictions.

Why does that matter here today? When you go to page 32 of the pooling and servicing agreement it tells you servicing advances, what they are, what those fees are and what the master servicer and the subservicer are expecting to do with regards to the collection of fees.

Late fees. It cost the servicers nothing to add a late fee to an account history. Every single month Ms. Rodriguez was not making a payment, and mind you, I'll go back to her original, she did make three payments that were returned, so she did make an effort after some of the initial default that was encouraged by First Horizon. She did try to get back on track and then they refused the payment. So to say she refused to make payments for several years when in fact they would never accept a payment from her during this time period.

\section*{But going back to First Horizon, why would First Horizon tell someone to default on their mortgage in order to get them a loan modification if getting a loan modification and all these other things doesn't make money for the bank. If the bank can only make money servicing performing loans one would think you would do everything you could to keep that loan performing. \\ But if the theme in this case has been default, then well help you. Oh, by the way, we can't help you. You can't afford it. And by "we" I'm saying Bank of New York Mellon. They hired all these different agents as their servicer. So, in fact, when First Horizon says we can't help you, Bank of New York Mellon was on that train with them. Just like when they went to the mediation with regard to Metife. Your Honor can look at the documents and see the certification. They said they were in possession of it. \\ Ms. Janati testified that note went to the custodian of US Bank. She was wrong. First Tennessee. But it went to the custodian; it never went anywhere else. So that certification was false. Why would they falsify the certification? Because they wanted to get their certification of completion so they can foreclose. \\ They said at that mediation she wasn't eligible for HAMP. If you look at the mediator's statement from}
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that where Ms. Bein explained to the Court in the Petition for Judicial Review that was filed by Metlife on behalf of themselves is what is in the pleading. And later within that says that they are the beneficiary of. They claim that they have the right to foreclose, they are the ones that are releasing the property because they did not think that compliance, a strict compliance, with the Foreclosure Mediation Program was required, that they were close enough and they should be able to foreclose.

Now we have had a body of law that has evolved since this time period in 2010 that has clearly pointed out the deficiencies in that argument. But more startling is the fact that they signed a certification saying they were in possession of the original but the one they have attached, everyone here has agreed, isn't a copy of the original as it existed; it was the copy that was made when it was originated in 2005 . So between 2005,2010 nothing could happen to the document. More importantly, it says I'm in possession, and that simply just isn't true.

They don't care because as long as we have the original note when we are actually forced to go dig it out of the collateral and bring it in, as long as we have that we're in good shape. We're okay. How am I supposed to trust that any of these certifications that are ever
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presented are true? How are we supposed to believe that, and why does it matter. Because the person sitting at
the table gets to decide whether that homeowner gets a loss mitigation option or not.

And we talked about bad faith. Bad faith - I can't imagine a better example of bad faith than this particular case. Not only just the history of the loan but the absolute indifference to the representations to the Court. Yeah, that's not the right document. So what. Yeah, it's a copy of a copy of a copy. Big deal. They don't care. And then they come into court and they don't want to be sanctioned because this is just like every other mediation.

Well, I can tell you T have done almost as many mediations as Lindsey testified to because not only do I represent horneowners, I have been a mediator myself. And I have been present at a lot of them. I have never seen somebody forge a note, at least not the context of sitting there at the mediation. Because after the mediation is the only way that we were able to prove it or show it. So how many times did it really happen? Why? I don't know. I don't know. And I think as a judicial officer sitting here, you have to be asking yourself why? Why do they do this? How did this happen? I don't understand. It doesn't make sense. If they have 222
nothing to gain from doing a foreclosure why would they do it? You gotta go back to the pooling and servicing agreement. You have to go and look at the reference with regard to how they actually get paid.

Ms. Janati testified that she doesn't really understand most of those documents. She's just saying we don't make any money. But when we talked about the fee she agreed that they get to put those fees on the file. We talked about ancillary. We talked about late fees. What the Court needs to focus on is not just that those fees are being advanced it's what is the net at the end of the transaction and who gets it and how would that motivate a servicer and a beneficiary to lie, cheat and abuse this process.

Exhibit 21, the registration statement filed by Nationstar. And on page 3 it states:
"Our servicing segment produces recurrent fee based revenue based upon contractually established servicing fees. Servicing fees primarily consist of an amount based on the aggregate unpaid principal balance of the loan service and also include ancillary fees such as the late fees, insufficient fund fees."
"In addition" - and this is the most important point with regards to all of the SEC documents that we have introduced in this case -- "we earn interest income 223
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on the amounts deposited in the collection account."
So when they pay the taxes, they pay the
insurance, they accrue late fees, they do inspection
fees, all the different fees I talked about with Ms.
Janati. When they put those in the collection account it
earns interest. The longer it takes to foreclose the
more interest they make. There's a financial incentive
to rack up these fees.
Now, you have to ask, okay, so they let it go
for a while and then they do the foreclosure. So what's
the motivating point to do the foreclosure? And it was
startling to me when I looked at this document in October
and found this out and I had my ah-ha, epiphany moment.
This is why they do this. The servicing fees, the
advances, everything that they have acquired and accrued,
truthful statement by Ms. Janati as of yet they haven't
made any money on this file since Nationstar took it
over. But what they stand to gain when they foreclose is
huge. I don't know if she was evading the answer or she
didn't know it. It doesn't really matter because the
document speaks for itself, as Mr. Stern said.
We use flexible high touch servicing model that focuses on personal contact with borrowers and it's designed to create borrower delinquencies and default on mortgages, et cetera. When they looked at the credit

```
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\section*{loss on this property the servicing fees primarily}
consist on the amount based on the ancillary fees as late
fees and insufficient funds. When the funds are not
sufficient to pay off all of what's accrued in that accounting, there is a recovery at the end of the foreclosure.

And if you look at the next 4, which is the next page in this Exhibit 21: "A servicer's rights and obligations are governed by the pooling and servicing agreement for the underlying loan. A subservicer's rights and obligations are governed by the subservicing agreement."

All of those have been introduced to you in the exhibits that we have.
"In the event of a foreclosure servicers are entitled to reimbursement of advances from the sales proceeds and related profits."

Counsel indicated it is no different than when an attorney advances costs for their client. Other than if I advance cost to a client I don't get to earn interest on it. I just get to recoup back what I put forward. There is no interest that is multiplying in which case I would be incentivized in almost a lender perspective to lend my money to gain interest on it and recover that original loan.
"Typically, in the event such proceeds are insufficient to reimburse the advances in full, which we refer to as nonrecoverable advance, servicers are entitled to reimbursement of advances from collections on other mortgage loans in the related mortgage backed security trust."

So it's the advance costs including the interest that is being accrued in that accounting exceeds the value of the property when they complete the foreclosure they can dip into the funds that they are collecting from all the other loans in the pool because they don't lose. If they foreclose they win. If the loan is performing they win because they are collecting payment, money is coming in and they are getting their fees.

It they have to advance all these costs they eventually, when they complete the foreclosure, recover. We talked about the services agreement with the attorney. The attorneys have a prorated fee. They get paid 50 percent if a loss mitigation option stops the foreclosure, but they get 100 percent when they complete the foreclosure sale.

Whether or not the foreclosure is completed the law firm's bottom line is affected and so is the servicer. You know who really loses here is the investors because every month that goes by that all these
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fees are being racked up that they're collecting was money that actually gets taken out of the pocket of the investor that the ultimate outcome is a foreclosure.

Meanwhile, the homeowners are just collateral damage and they are small and they are insignificant. And because they want to narrow your focus to only the tail of the elephant you can't look at the whole big picture. This homeowner perceived benefit by the bank is almost an insult based on what has happened in this particular case and the information that the Court has been presented with.

When we talk about sanctions, especially in a de novo review capacity, our Supreme Court has held that sanctions are to be imposed based on equity. What's equitable. What is equitable for the Court to make in a determination. There is several factors to consider and I will get into the rationalization for that once I conclude going through this document.

For this reason advances and the right of reimbursement are typically senior to the claim of holders of security issued by the residential mortgage backed securities trust. So not only do they get paid, they get paid first. And if there is nothing left over for the investor, so be it. That answers the why. Why do they want to foreclose instead of a loan modification.
227
Well, if they did loan modification with a principle
reduction, they would be cutting their noses to spite
their face, because their fee is based upon what that
unpaid principle balance is on the loan. It says so in
the servicing agreement. Master servicer, basis is 50.
For the subservicer usually around \(20,25\).

So if they reduce their unpaid principle balance on that loan, their ultimate fee that they collect on it once it's performing is reduced. What's the incentive to reduce the principle balance especially when they know when they complete the foreclosure how much money they are gonna get from all those advanced costs, fees, interest, and they get paid first. And if they let it go for five or six years and it still hasn't resulted in a foreclosure that's okay because they can recover it from all the other loans in the pools that are performing.

It's a win-win-win situation for the servicer. And a lose-lose-lose situation. And 1 can already anticipate the argument that, Well, that just really goes down the scope here because we need to talk about what happened at this particular mediation.

But I don't think it's fair to have said, why, after three mediations and being told in one, Well, we don't participate in HAMP, you can't have it; now you don't make enough money; oh, we might review you two
weeks after the mediation, but we can't really offer you anything here today.

And Ms. Janati said we reduced it down to two percent. Well, that's the first step in the waterfall. She didn't talk about extending the term. She didn't talk about forbearance. At no point in time did we demand and insist that there be some principle reduction.

I ran an MPD test based on this, based on the FDIC model. When you put in her income, it was a two percent interest, you extend it by 40 years, and at the time of the mediation in 2011 I don't know what the arrears are at this point, but if you forbear almost 130,000 in the principle, forbear, meaning sitting at the back end of the loan not accruing interest, it did generate an affordable payment based on her expenses right at \(\$ 1,000\). It all added up. She still had a \(\$ 250\) cushion.

If they have the incentive to give her a loan modification, I have seen people in much greater desperate scenarios and much worse back-end ratios to get a loan modification. They don't have incentive to give a mod because that's not how they make the most money. It has nothing to do with the allegation that, of course, she ended up in mediation because her payment was unaffordable. That's why she elected mediation to go
there, talk and negotiate. But every offer they ever gave was a higher payment or the same payment. And then eventually there is no retention option for you. Short sale the house. It's unfair.

And to show up in this setting and say that they participated in good faith, again, it goes back to the elephant. They are not showing you the whole big picture. They are not showing you what's really happening in this situation. They are using bits and pieces because they are trying to limit your view because they don't want you to understand how this really works.

If we have done nothing else today, that is our hope, that we have at least enlightened this Court, and hopefully many others, with regards to what is really going on. What is really happening. Why do some people get a HAMP modification while others don't. Because whether or not the homeowner gets that modification there are certain factors that are going to control. Sometimes it is the homeowner's income and financials. But most of the time the bottom line of the servicer who is showing up and make the representation it's what's in their best interest and that usually dictates and drives. And in this situation that is absolutely what happened.

When you look at the registration statement that Nationstar filed with the SEC, Exhibit 20, page 339, the 230
principle servicing compensation to be paid back to servicer in respect to this master-servicing activities for each period of security will be equal to the percentage per annum described in the related prospectus supplement of the outstanding principle balance of each loan.

If the servicer reduces the principle balance they reduce their own fee. And this compensation will be retained by it from collection of interest on the loan in the related trust fund. The master servicing fee. A compensation for servicing dues, a subservicer. If there is no subservicer, the master servicer will be entitled to a monthly servicing fee.

In addition, generally the master servicer or subservicer will retain all prepayment charges, assumption fees and late payment charges to the extent that they are collectable from the borrower and any benefit that may accrue as a result of the investment of those funds in their security account.

In the short run, do they make money off of the foreclosure? Well, no. Because they are spending time on people to appear at mediation, produce these documents, and show up at these hearings and do all of that. But it rains when the foreclosure is completed.

In addition, the master servicer will be
```

entitled to reimbursement for certain expenses incurred
by it in connection with any defaulted mortgage as to
which it has determined that all recoverable liquidation
proceeds and insurance proceeds have been received.
And in connection with the restoration of the
property, there is just not a lose situation. The only
thing that the servicer is out is the pledge towards
paying for all of these ancillary services by other
vendors in the interim between the default occurring and
the realization of foreclosure itself.
So now we understand why; the servicer makes
money, the master servicer makes money, Bank of New York
Mellon makes money, Nationstar makes money. They are all
going to make money when this house is foreclosed on.
That is their incentive. Why does that matter to
Catherine? Because who's sitting at that table and who
is actually going to be the entity affected by the
outcome of the foreclosure should be the person that you
are negotiating with. When you are sitting there it is
required that the actual beneficiary appear or
representative or the authority. Well, the problem here
is the servicer is always going to be the one that
appears. The servicer is always the one that comes
because it's the delegation of the contract in this
sense. It's the delegation authority in the system

```
that's been created by Bank of New York Mellon. Bank of
New York Mellon has incentivized its servicers to take
peoples' houses through foreclosure based on the fee
structure.

And even in their annual report they highlight the fact that their income is completely generated by fees. Over 70 percent of Bank of New York Mellon's income is based on fees. Not from investment, not from some of the other servicing, but from the fee.

Exhibit 27, the 2011 Bank of New York Mellon annual reports produced. This is relevant to the time of the mediation, which was in October of 2011:
"During 2011 we made significant progress on a number of fronts. We achieved above median revenue growth compared to our peers. We implemented a series of efficiency initiatives to reduce our cost base and manage through our current environment with clear evidence of progress on expenses in our fourth quarter results."

Well, what are expenses to the trustee? In this case getting the custodial file and paying for it to be shipped for its lawyers, obtaining the custodial file to ensure that all the documents are there and they are correct and accurate.

They cut corners to lower their costs. They are in complete contradiction to our statute in 107, but it's
okay because it is very burdensome and very difficult for them to go to the trouble and expense of getting those documents and because they are super important because they are endorsed in blank and we don't want them to fall into anybody else's hands. They have to be shipped in a very specific manner. My understanding, it has actually cost them quite a bit of money, over \(\$ 200\), in order to ship those documents and have them entered into the law firm's system.

Kristin testified they have a huge protocol for that because it's so important, it's such a huge issue, but it's also costly. So if we just use the imaging file and everybody just says horseshoes and hand grenades, it's close enough, we don't have to pay for that document to be moved around. And in fact their own client testified, that document doesn't move around.

So for all three of these mediations there were representations made that the servicers were in possession and they never were.

And even if someone from Nationstar had signed that certification it wouldn't be true because the document would still sit in the hands of the custodian. It didn't come out of the hands of the custodian until June of 2013.

Bank of New York Mellon says:
"To appreciate our potential and comprehend the nature of our challenges it is necessary to understand what we do. We are an investment company with significant scale. Our model is primarily fee based with little credit risk. A large percentage of our revenue, 78 percent, comes from recurring fees which is above our peer group. That has helped us maintain a strong highly liquid balance sheet with a solid capital position."

Bank of New York Mellon third quarter earnings in 2011 were \(\$ 651,000,000\). That was just their quarterly earnings. That's not their annual. And that's certainly not their net worth.

So what's the incentive of this bank to avoid incurring that \(\$ 250\) fee for the thousands and thousands and thousands of loans that it's foreclosing on. Do the math. If they did 5 to 10,000 foreclosures times \(\$ 250\) that becomes a pretty good cost saving to be able to avoid that. They have incentivised their subservicers to cut these corners and to create what they call in their quarterly report "maximizing efficiency." Maximizing efficiency. At what cost. Because they have already admitted they don't know where this document came from. Ms. Janati said absolutely this is wrong. Somebody from Nationstar did it. We don't know who. She didn't tell us that there was an internal investigation. There is
only 20 or so people that work in the mediation
department. There is no information that was provided that they were queried.

Your Honor's order said that everyone present at the mediation was supposed to be present today. We got this hearing continued. Where is Daniel Marks? He was on the phone on behalf of Nationstar. My client testified that he said we own the loan. Nationstar owns it. We are servicing it but we own it. That wasn't true.

And even after the continuance they had an opportunity to bring Dan. He was on the witness list and still works at Nationstar. He didn't come here today to explain what happened. He did not come here today to explain that note. It's convenient to bring witnesses with very little personal knowledge about what transpired with this original loan and to bring a corporate witness who can vaguely understand their own policies and procedures and continue to send a message of this is what they should do. But that's not what they did.

I find it interesting that during the first day of testimony for Ms. Janati she was asked, Was Ms. Rodriguez' loan treated any differently - was it uniquely treated compared to anyone else's? And her answer was no.
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Well, that is startling because if every single one of their loans is treated like this one I have a hard time feeling that there is any integrity with regards to their appearances and representations at mediation if they are stamping their names on notes, doing whatever they can to try to get that certificate of completion and foreclose on the house.

Lindsey testified, Yeah, we did get a
continuance. You agreed to a continuance of the mediation because we needed more time to review. But when it came down to it, the more time to review my client's documents and determine whether it should go for a loan modification had nothing to do with it. It was they wanted more time so they could scramble to put together some semblance of documents that would pass muster with that mediator and hopefully get her that certificate so they could cash in.

They never said we need more time because your client is missing a document. We need more time because of the escrow analysis that popped up at the mediation, which had never been mentioned in the e-mail. It was simply, We don't have the document; can we get more time.

That shows their intent and their incentive from the very beginning, which is we had no incentive to do a mod and we don't intend to. We're just trying to get our

\footnotetext{
act together so we can get our certificate and finish this foreclosure up.

In the history of the Foreclosure Mediation Program the cases that come out from it, our Supreme Court has repeatedly acknowledged the importance of adherence to the document requirements. It is not for the sake of having the document and having a checklist. It's to ensure, to borrow their words, that the parties that are sitting at the table are the right parties so that it is a meaningful and honest negotiation in order to show that the parties are participating in good faith.

If there is no incentive to modify and there's no intention to modify and they are throwing out forged and fraudulent documents hoping that they can foreclose, I can't imagine anything that is more exemplary of bad faith.
}

You can't look at the documents they produced in this case and treat it the same as not having one at all. They produced that document because they had a shred of hope that the mediator would find it sufficient especially when the person on the phone is saying, Well, this just transferred and you know this is really hard on us, but we own it. See, our name's on it. We are the right ones here. We are doing everything we can in hope that the mediator wouldn't check all the boxes and they 238
would be able to get their certificate.
What a miscarriage of justice that would have been. That mediator, though, found it deficient. We had no idea at that point in time who we were supposed to be talking to, who we were supposed to be dealing with. And then when the judicial foreclosure was filed without the endorsement, here we go again with the lack of documentation. At that point in time, still didn't really know who the parties were that we were dealing with. Why is Bank of New York Mellon all of a sudden foreclosing; I thought this was a Nationstar stamp.

When the Amended Complaint was filed and the version that's been introduced into the evidence here today, when the Amended Complaint was filed there's a white text box over where the Nationstar used to be, and you can pull the exhibits and line it all up and Nationstar Mortgage LLC is exactly what fits under that box.

They did not even go to the trouble to go back to the imaging file or get the custodial; they just took the bogus document that was at the mediation and covered that up and filed it. It's sloppy. It's lazy. And it shows absolute disrespect to our judicial system and to the Court.

And then in that hearing when they finatly
showed up with the original document, now we know for sure, it's a blank endorsement with a red circle around it. It doesn't look anything like anything we've ever seen before, that's when we knew for sure that the document that had been presented at the mediation had been forged. And we brought it to this Court's attention and that's why we're here today.

If they hadn't done a judicial foreclosure and they hadn't been forced to bring the original we would still be cycling through nonjudicial foreclosure proceedings.

During the motion for summary judgment the attomey for the bank argued, You can't consider anything that happened in the mediation. You can't consider our forgery because we have the original here today. They should file a PJR. How are we supposed to file a PJR when we don't know about it? We did file one. And, now, here today they are saying, Oh, don't worry about it. We're going to deal with all these issues in the judicial foreclosure.

They are using the mediation program as a sword and a shield. They are participating in it in hopes that they can get their foreclosure certificate and take the house. But if they don't and they do anything wrong or bad you can't hold them accountable for it.

It's an absolute abuse of the process and the statute requires that the integrity of the program be maintained, not only by the rules but also by the imposition of sanctions.

Chapter 107, Section 4 , states that there are requirements with regard to the original or certified copy of the note. In each assignment the beneficiary of the deed of trust is represented at the mediation by another person, that person has to have authority.

The purpose of the rules is to make sure that the parties that are appearing are the proper parties that are able to negotiate. The Court may issue an order imposing such sanction against a beneficiary of the deed of trust, Bank of New York Mellon in this case, or the representative as the Court determines appropriate, Nationstar in this case, including, without limitation requiring a loan modification if deemed appropriate by the Court.

The other provision the statute that I would draw the Court's attention to with regard to the imposition of sanctions is paragraph 8 , Section \(D\), which establishes procedures to protect the mediation process from abuse and to ensure that each party at mediation acts in good faith is one of the purposes of the rules that are implemented.

So our rules don't allow them to bring whatever they want and whether or not it's accurate and that's close enough. The whole purpose of all of these rules and documents is to try to motivate the parties to reach a resolution and to mediate in good faith.

How do we know they mediated in good faith? Because they used every effort to reach a resolution that was viable at the time. Well, they didn't do that in this case. And the reason they didn't because they made more money off of the foreclosure.

The last point I would like to make is with regard to the monetary incentive. Talked about Bank of New York Mellon and their finances. According to Nationstar's registration statement that was on file in this case, they went in April of 2011 from 2,176 employees to 2,599 employees in just that December.

So in an eight month time period they had increased their employees by 423 , which is quite a lot. But when you look at the number of loans, you realize they did not hire enough people because between March of 2011 their unpaid principle balance was at \(\$ 67\) billion. But by December of that year they had increased by over 70 percent to 106.6. 70.2 percent growth rate, but that doesn't match the number of employees.

So they've taken on all these loans, admittedly,
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they are the largest servicer in the country right now according to the testimony of their attomey and their corporate witness. They are increasing astronomically. They are not hiring enough staff and they cutting corners.

When sanctions are imposed on an equitable basis you have to consider three things: One, the egregiousness of the conduct; two, the meaningfulness of the sanction based on the financial condition of the parties being sanctioned; and three, that the sanction is appropriate to have a deterrent effect.

At the September hearing I parked at a meter because 1 thought surely we won't be here very long. We were here very long. I was running the risk of getting a parking ticket. A parking ticket is \(\$ 20\) in Nevada, and based on income, unfortunately, sometimes being a lawyer and running around the courthouse we get parking tickets and we make that cost benefit analysis of I don't want to be out feeding my meter when the judge calls my case; that would be very bad and shows disrespect to the Court. I don't want to do that. So I make that cost benefit analysis. Because sometimes I don't feed the meter and I don't get a ticket. But even when I get the ticket I can afford it.

The banks do the same thing in this situation.

\section*{How much does it cost them to get the document. How much does it cost them to do it right versus how many times do they get caught when they don't. They make a cost benefit analysis. I urge the Court to consider the sanctions in this case based on the mentality of what they understand, and that's the bottom line. \\ If you affect their bottom line, they are going to take this program more seriously, they are going to take the foreclosure laws in this state more seriously because it's going to have a serious consequence when they don't. \\ Up until today, the fear of the unknown has tempered a lot of that cost benefit analysis because up until today, to my knowledge at least in Clark County, and it's a small group of lawyers that practice in this area, no one has presented the Court with absolute forgery that's easy to identify and has been admitted to on the stand. \\ So with regards to bad faith, this probably sets the cap on the worst thing that you could do and what the worst situation is that the Court can proceed. \\ There are lots of lawyers in this town that are probably wondering what the outcome of this case will be because now they will be able to advise their clients. The fear of the unknown is gone; we now know what the cap}
is, so if we forge documents this is what the punishment could range up to be.

There will be, like it or not, based on the decision in this case a perceived cost benefit analysis and math formula that they now will he able to use in making recommendations with regards to how they are going to proceed with foreclosure. If there are substantial sanctions in this case, and I think they are absolutely warranted, they will think twice before they forge a document. They will respect the integrity of the system and they will respect the integrity of this court.

Give them a parking ticket, they won't. They simply won't because the chances of them getting a parking ticket are substantially low, and they can afford it. It's almost like trying to decide to pick a penny up that's sitting on the ground. Do you really want to get your fingers dirty to pick it up. No, I will walk by, let it go.

So what's it take to be meaningful to a corporation whose net worth is over \(\$ 36\) billion. The Supreme Court has upheld sanctions where the financial considerations have been considered of the defendant with one percent of their income. Well, that would be \(\$ 380\) million, Your Honor. One percent of their net worth would be \(\$ 380\) million. I could not even make that happen 245
on my calculator. I had to actually go and get another tool to make that calculation. Because I was just curious, what percent of 38 billion? \(\$ 380\) million. That's a lot of zeros.

Nationstar, their net worth, \(\$ 4.9\) bilion. What is the right math? Is it one percent? And I will couch this on the fact that, yes, if sanctions are imposed in this case, there is a perceived benefit to the petitioner. But this isn't the petitioner. This is about the conduct of the respondents in this case.

They admitted that they presented a document that has been altered and is incorrect. They knew it. They continued to file incorrect copies even in this case. They still didn't file the original. It was in their possession. It's because it doesn't matter to them. And counsel even testified, Well, copy of a copy of a copy is okay, as long as we show the original when we are forced to. It's okay.

How do we get them to change. A parking ticket is not going to do it. The average person in Nevada makes \(\$ 50,000\). A parking ticket is \(\$ 20\). If you got a parking ticket once a year it equates to about .0001 percent of your income. But if you make \(\$ 100,000\) a year and you get one parking ticket a year that number continues to dilute and diminish. So how do we get the 246
same ratio to get their attention with regard to the importance of the accuracy, the validity and the reliability, not only of certification but their intentions and motivation in going into the mediation to even give them a modiffcation to begin with. How do we trust that they are going to be truthful and accurate. Because they need to know there is a consequence when they don't.

This case is being presented to the Court because it's the proper forum to address the issues of a nonjudicial foreclosure. There are thousands of homes where homeowner does not clect mediation that just pass through. It is very limited circumstances - I cannot imagine in my whole legal career I will run across a case like this again where there is forgery -- just a plethora of mistakes.

But what really shocked me is just how unaffected they seem to be. They just don't see this as being outrageous. They don't see this as being such an unbelievable outcome. And I can't help but think because they do it all the time. Why is it outrageous; this is what we do. Yeah, it was a mistake with the whole stamp thing, but everything else, that's pretty much par for the course. It's shocking. And if it was so shocking to them, where is the investigation? Where is the change in
```

policies and procedures? It has been over two years
Lindsey informed them that this note is not correct and
they didn't do anything about it.
Looking at just income, not net worth, looking at income, based on the documents that we have produced in this case with regard to annual reports, 2011 net income, Bank of New York Mellon, $\$ 2.5$ million. One percent of that is $\$ 25$ million. Nationstar, $\$ 205$ million in revenue, and their one percent is $\$ 2$ million.
When we look at one percent of whether it's just their net income or their net worth, it's millions of dollars before it really affects their bottom or bas an affect on them.
I have heard other attorneys in town say sanctions have been imposed by judges with regard to the foreclosure mediation, including attorneys fees and thousands of dollars, tens of thousands of dollars. I can't help but think that that is just a parking ticket and that's why the conduct continues.
This is an exemplary case where substantial sanctions are warranted. I believe the Court should use an equitable application of those sanctions based on the three-prong analysis of reasonable in light of the egregious conduct, which I believe this is egregious conduct. It's meaningful to the party based on their

```

\section*{financial benefit.}

Your Honor has all kinds of different ways to use the financial calculations we provided to you in order to determine what is equitable. But more importantly, and what my snncem is, adequate to deter future contact.

How do we convince Bank of New York Mellon, its agents through Nationstar and agents through these law firms, they process the procedure and the law seriously and to respect what their obligated to do whether they like it or not and do it the right way. What is it going to take to make this an adequate sanction to encourage, not just this group, everyone else that's out there taking peoples' houses.

What do we have to do to make sure they do it the right way. Because up until now nothing seems to lave been a sufficient enough of a deterrent because they haven't changed their policy. They continue to file bogus documents out of the imaging system and nobody thinks its important to go get the original. I disagree with that. I think our Supreme Court disagrees with it and I think our statute and our legislature they all disagree with it too.

This is your opportunity to send them a message. I am hopeful that we presented enough information to
support a substantial sanction. I cortainly belicve the
facts in this case warrant it, and I leave it in your
hands.
THE COURT: I appreciate cveryone's effort. Ms. Schuler-Hintz.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Your Honor, I think that
Ms. Newberry gave quite a considerable amount of testimony that we should be allowed to rebut here. I will be as brief as possible.

THE COURT: I am going do conclude remarks now with Ms. Newberry's remarks, however, not that I am inviting this, but if you wanted to get leave of court to file some additional briefing that you thought would be valuable you can seek that. But I indicated that we would finish with Ms. Newberry. She did not get to start. I appreciate that she got to finish. The Court can weigh all of that.

I know what your position is. I know what Mr. Stern's position is. I am not really trying to shortcut you in any way, 1 just don't think it's necessary for any rebuttal.

MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: I understand, Your Honor. I just have to make the effort.

THE COURT: I know that and I appreciate you asking. And as I said, if you want do additional
```

briefing, the Court will always entertain any motions
that are filed.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Your Honor, would you like
us to do that via motion?
THE COURT: If you are so inclined and you think
it's necessary you can do it via motion on the calendar,
but, again -"-
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: We'll do that, Your Honor.
Well just reserve the right to file -- if we feel after
we discuss it and we feel it is necessary, we will
reserve the right to file a motion requesting
supplemental briefing.
THE COURT: You may.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Otherwise, I will conclude the
remarks today. And I take all of the matters that come
over to evidentiary hearing, all that come on an order to
show cause in fact, very, very seriously. I always
appreciate when counsel has gone to the effort to provide
everything that the Court possibly needs to and can
review, and we have had that in abundance and I
appreciate the opportunity.
And the Court will review everything that it has
and issue a decision at the earliest opportunity. And
other than that we will conclude our matter today.
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\section*{Section 1: Public Section}

\section*{Imtroduction}

This Public Section provides an overview of the overall resolution strategy for The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation and its material entities, including its principal bank subsidiary, The Bank of New York Mellon. References to "our," "we," "us," and "BNY Mellon," refer to The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation and its consolidated subsidiaries, while references to the "Parent" refer solely to The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation, the parent company.

Title I, Section 165(d) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "DoddFrank Act") and implementing regulations issued by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (the "FDIC") and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (the "Federal Reserve") require bank holding companies with assets of \(\$ 50\) billion or more, such as the Parent, to submit periodically to the Federal Reserve, the FDIC and the Financial Stability Oversight Council a plan for resolution in the event of material distress or failure of the bank holding company. The FDIC has also issued a final rule that requires insured depository institutions with assets of \(\$ 50\) billion or more, such as The Bank of New York Mellon, to submit periodically to the FDIC a plan for resolution in the event of failure under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (the "FD| Act"). Accordingly, we have developed a resolution plan in conformity with both rules (the "Resolution Plan"), including this Public Section which contains the information required by the regulators to be made available publicly.

BNY Mellon supports the regulatory reform efforts implemented since the financial crisis to mitigate systemic risk and improve global financial stability. BNY Mellon believes no firm should be "too big to fail" and that, regardless of size, financial institutions should be able to be resolved without taxpayer or U.S. government support. BNY Mellon endorses the concept of resolution planning as a key element of risk management to protect the soundness of the global financial system.

BNY Mellon has a strong balance sheet in terms of capital, liquidity and asset quality. Our model is primarily fee-based with no substantial exposure to credit risk. A large percentage of our revenuemore than the median revenue of our peers-comes from recurring fees. This helps BNY Mellon maintain a strong, highly liquid balance sheet with a solid capital position and strong credit ratings.

As required by supervisory guidance, the Resolution Plan considers strategies for the resolution of BNY Mellon in the event of an idiosyncratic event that causes material financial distress or failure, and assumes that this idiosyncratic event may occur at a time when general macroeconomic conditions are consistent with either baseline, adverse or severely adverse economic scenarios.

The Resolution Plan sets out a detailed description of the resolution options for the Parent and each of its material entities, including The Bank of New York Mellon, with a focus on ensuring their orderly resolution in a manner that preserves value, ensures continuity of services, and avoids systemic risk to the U.S. financial system. In each of the resolution strategies, depositors would have timely access to their insured deposits and there would be no cost to the FDIC Deposit Insurance Fund.

In the unlikely event a resolution of BNY Mellon were necessary, there are several factors that contribute to the resolvability of BNY Mellon under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and other applicable insolvency regimes, including the facts that (i) the bulk of BNY Mellon's core business lines and critical operations are conducted in The Bank of New York Mellon, which would allow the FDIC to use its traditional resolution powers in recelvership under the FDI Act to facilitate the orderly disposition or wind down of The Bank of New York Mellon, (ii) the core business lines and critical operations conducted through non-bank entities of BNY Mellon are largely self-contained within separate legal entities, allowing for their rapid divestiture or orderly wind-down, if necessary, under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, and (iii) our highly liquid balance sheet would allow us to withstand deposit run-off without systemic impact.

While BNY Mellon could similarly be resolved without systemic impact under the Orderly Liquidation Authority of Titie II of the Dodd-Frank Act, pursuant to which the FDIC is granted the power and authority to resolve systemically important financial institutions in a manner analogous to the resolution of failed insured depository institutions under the FDI Act, the Dodd-Frank Act implementing regulations specifically require the Resolution Plan to provide a strategic analysis of resolvability under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and certain other applicable insolvency regimes. Accordingly, the Orderly Liquidation Authority is outside the scope of the Resolution Plan.

The information contained in the Resolution Plan, including this Public Section, has been prepared in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements and guidance. Any differences in the presentation of information concerning our businesses and operations contained herein relative to how BNY Mellon presents such information for other purposes is solely due to our efforts to comply with the rules governing the submission of resolution plans. The information presented herein, including the designation of "material entities" and "core business lines", does not, in any way, reflect changes to our organizational structure, business practices or strategy.

\section*{Overvew af Bry Mellon}

The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation, a Delaware corporation (NYSE symbol: BK), is a global investments company dedicated to helping its clients manage and service their financial assets throughout the investment lifecycle. Whether providing financial services for institutions, corporations or individual investors, BNY Mellon delivers informed investment management and investment services in 35 countries and more than 100 markets.

We were formed as a bank holding company and have our executive offices in New York, New York. With its predecessors, BNY Mellon has been in business since 1784.

Our two principal banks are:
- The Bank of New York Mellon, a New York state chartered bank, which houses our Investment Services businesses, including Asset Servicing, Issuer Services, Treasury Services, Broker-Dealer and Advisor Services as well as the bank-advised business of Asset Management; and
- BNY Mellon, National Association, a nationally-chartered bank, which houses our Wealth Management business.

Our two principal U.S. banks engage in trust and custody activities, investment management services, banking services and various securities-related activities.

We have four other U.S. bank and/or trust companies concentrating on trust products and services across the United States: The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, National Association, BNY Mellon Trust of Delaware, BNY Mellon Investment Servicing Trust Company and BNY Mellon Trust Company of Illinois. Most of our asset management businesses, along withour Pershing businesses, are direct or indirect non-bank subsidiaries of BNY Mellon.

We divide our businesses into two principal segments, Investment Management and Investment Services.

Our Investment Management business is comprised of our affiliated investment management boutiques, wealth management business and global distribution companies, Our Investment Management business is responsible, through various subsidiaries, for U.S. and non-U.S. retail, intermediary and institutional investment management, distribution and related services. The investment management boutiques offer a broad range of equity, fixed income, cash and alternative/overlay products. We are one of the world's largest asset managers with a top-10 position in the U.S., Europe and globally. Through BNY Mellon Wealth Management, we offer a full array of investment management, wealth and estate planning and private banking solutions to help clients protect, grow and transfer their wealth through an extensive network of offices in the U.S., Canada, UK and Asia. Clients include high-net-worth individuals and families, charitable gift programs, endowments and foundations and related entities.

Our Investment Services business provides global custody and related services, collateral services, alternative investment services, corporate trust and depositary receipt services, as well as clearing
services and global payment/working capital solutions to institutional clients. Our clients include corporations, public funds and government agencies, foundations and endowments; global financial institutions including banks, broker-dealers, asset managers, insurance companies and central banks; financial intermediaries and independent registered investment advisors and hedge fund managers. We help our clients service their financial assets through a network of offices and operations centers in 35 countries across six continents.

Additional information related to BNY Mellon is contained in BNY Mellon's reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC"), including our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2012 (which contains the Annual Report to Shareholders (the "2012 Annual Report") included with the \(10-K\) ) (the "2012 Form 10-K"), the Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q and the Current Reports on Form 8-K (each, a " 34 Act Report"). These ' 34 Act Reports can be viewed, as they become available, on the SEC's website at www.sec.gov and at www.bnymellon.com. Information contained in ' 34 Act Reports that BNY Mellon makes with the SEC subsequent to the date of filings referenced in this document, including the 2012 Form 10-K, may modify, update and supersede such information contained in this document.

Unless otherwise indicated, the information in this document concerning BNY Mellon's assets, llabilities, capital and funding sources contained in Section Cbelow has been extracted from the 2012 Annual Report. Such information speaks only as of the date of the 2012 Annual Report. Unless otherwise indicated, all other information is as set forth in our quarterly report on Form 10-Q for the period ended June 30, 2012.

This document and BNY Mellon's'34 Act Reports referred to above contain forward-looking statements within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. Words such as "estimate," "forecast," "project," "anticipate," "confident," "target," "expect," "intend," "seek," "believe," "plan," "goal," "could," "should," "may," "will," "strategy," "opportunities," "trends" and words of similar meaning, signify forward-looking statements. These statements are based on the current beliefs and expectations of BNY Mellon's management and are subject to significant risks and uncertainties that are subject to change based on various important factors (some of which are beyond BNY Mellon's controll. Actual results may differ materially from those set forth in the forward-looking statements. Factors that could cause BNY Mellon's actual results to differ materially from those described in the forward-looking statements can be found in the "Risk Factors" section of the 2012 Form 10-K and Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q filed with the SEC. All forward-looking statements speak only as of the date on which such statements are made and BNY Mellon does not undertake to update the forward-looking statements to reflect the impact of circumstances or events that may arise after the date of the forward-looking statements.
A. Names of Material Entities

The following list of BNY Mellon entities includes the covered company and the subsidiaries and foreign offices that are deemed "material entities" for purposes of the Resolution Plan:
- BNY Investment Management Services LLC
- BNY Mellon International Operations (India) Private Limited
- BNY Mellon Investment Servicing (US) Inc.
- iNautix Technologies India Private Limited
- MBSC Securities Corporation
- Pershing llC
- Technology Services Group, Inc.
- Tennessee Processing Center LLC
- The Bank of New York Mellon
- The Bank of New York Mellon-Brussels Branch
- The Bank of New York Mellon-London Branch
- The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation
- The Bank of New York Mellon SA/NV
- The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, N.A.
- The Dreyfus Corporation
\({ }^{1}\) For purposes of resolution plans required under Section \(165(\mathrm{~d})\) of the Dodd-Frank Act ("SIFI Plan"), a "material entity" is defined as: "...a subsidiary or foreign office of the covered company that is significant to the activities of a critical operation or core business line." 12 CFR Part 243 (Federal Reserve) or 12 CFR Part 381 (FDIC). For purposes of resolution plans required for insured depository institutions with assets of \(\$ 50\) billion or more ("IDI Plan"), a "material entity" is defined as: "...a company that is significant to the activities of a critical service or core business line." 12 CFR Part 360 (FDIC).
B. Description of Core Business Lines

The following businesses are deemed "core business lines" \({ }^{2}\) for purposes of the Resolution Plan:
Asset servicing
BNY Mellon Asset Servicing offers clients worldwide a broad spectrum of specialized asset servicing capabilities, including custody and fund services, performance and analytics, and execution services. BNY Mellon is the largest custodian for U.S. corporate and public pension plans and services \(46 \%\) of the top 50 endowments. We are a leading custodian in the UK and service \(20 \%\) of UK pensions that require a custodian.

\section*{Corporate Tiust}

BNY Mellon is the leading provider of corporate trust services for all major conventional and structured finance debt categories, and a leading provider of specialty services.

\section*{Clearing Services}

Pershing, our clearing service, provides business solutions to approximately 1,600 financial organizations globally by delivering dependable operational support; robust trading services; flexible technology; an expansive array of investment solutions, practice management support and service excellence.

\section*{Asset Management}

Our asset management business is comprised of our affiliated investment management boutiques. Our asset management business is responsible, through various subsidiaries, for U.S. and non U.S. retail, intermediary and institutional investment management, distribution and related services. The investment management boutiques offer a broad range of equity, fixed income, cash and alternative/overlay products. We are one of the world's largest asset managers with a top-10 position in the U.S., Europe and globally.

Additional information related to BNY Mellon's businesses is contained in BNY Mellon's reports filed with the SEC, including the 2012 Form \(10-\mathrm{K}\), the Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q and the Current Reports on Form 8-K, available at wow.bnymellon.com.

\footnotetext{
\({ }^{2}\) For purposes of SIFI Plans, "core business lines" are defined as: "...those business lines of the covered company, including associated operations, services, functions and support that, in the view of the covered company, upon failure would result in a material loss of revenue, profit or franchise value." 1.2 CFR Part 243 (Federal Reserve) or 12 CFR Part 381 (FDIC). For purposes of IDI Plans, "core business lines" are defined as: "..those business lines of the [covered insured depository institution], including associated operations, services, functions and support that, in the view of the [covered insured depository institution], upon failure would result in a material loss of revenue, profit or franchise value." 12 CFR Part 360 (FDIC).
}
C. Summary of Financial Information Regarding Assets, Liabilities, Capital and Major Funding Sources
The table below provides a consolidated balance sheet for The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation as of December 31, 2012.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{(dollar amounts in millions, except per share amounts)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Assets} \\
\hline Cash and due from: & \\
\hline Banks & \$4,727 \\
\hline Interest-bearing deposits with the Federal Reserve and other central banks & 90,110 \\
\hline Interest-bearing deposits with banks & 43,910 \\
\hline Federal funds sold and securities purchased under resale agreements & 6,593 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Securities:} \\
\hline Held-to-maturity (fair value of \$8,389) & 8,205 \\
\hline Available-for-sale & 92,619 \\
\hline Total securities & 100,824 \\
\hline Trading assets & 9,378 \\
\hline Loans & 46,629 \\
\hline Allowance for loan losses & (266) \\
\hline Net loans & 46,363 \\
\hline Premises and equipment & 1,659 \\
\hline Accrued interest receivable & 593 \\
\hline Goodwill & 18,075 \\
\hline Intangible assets & 4,809 \\
\hline Other assets (includes \$1,299 at fair value) & 20,468 \\
\hline Subtotal assets of operations & 347,509 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Assets of consolidated investment management funds, at fair value:} \\
\hline Trading assets & 10,961 \\
\hline Other assets & 520 \\
\hline Subtotal assets of consolidated investment management funds, at fair value & 11,481 \\
\hline Total assets & \$358,990 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Liabilities} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Deposits:} \\
\hline Noninterest-bearing (principally U.S. offices) & \$93,019 \\
\hline interest-bearing deposits in U.S. offices & 53,826 \\
\hline Noninterest-bearing deposits in Non-U.S. offices & 99,250 \\
\hline Total deposits & 246,095 \\
\hline Federal funds purchased and securities sold under repurchase agreements & 7,427 \\
\hline Trading liabilities & 8,176 \\
\hline Payables to customers and broker-dealers & 16,095 \\
\hline Commercial paper & 338 \\
\hline Other borrowed funds & 1,380 \\
\hline Accrued taxes and other expenses & 7,316 \\
\hline Other liabilities (including allowance for lending-related commitments of \(\$ 121\), also includes \(\$ 578\) at fair value) & 6,010 \\
\hline Long-term debt (includes \(\$ 345\) at fair value) & 18,530 \\
\hline Subtotal liablitities of operations & 311,367 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Liabilities of corisolidated investment management funds, at fair value:} \\
\hline Trading liabilities & 10,152 \\
\hline Other liabilities & 29 \\
\hline Subtotal liabilities of consolidated investment management funds, at fair value & 10,0181 \\
\hline Total liablities & 321,548 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l|} 
Temporary equity \\
Redeemable noncontrolling interests \\
Permanent equity \\
Preferred stock - par value \(\$ 0.01\) per share; authorized \(100,000,000\) preferred shares; issued \\
10,826 shares \\
Common stock - par value \(\$ 0.01\) per share; authorized \(3,500,000,000\) common shares; issued \\
\(1,254,182,209\) shares \\
Additional paid-in capital \\
Retained earnings \\
Accumulated other comprehensive loss, net of tax \\
Less: Treasury stock of \(90,691,868\) common shares, at cost \\
\hline Total The Bank of New York Mellon Corporation shareholders' equity \\
Non-redeemable noncontrolling interests of consolidated investment management funds \\
\hline Total permanent equity \\
\hline Totalliabilities, temporary equityand permanent equity \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: 2012 Annual Report.
The table below provides a consolidated balance sheet for The Bank of New York Melion as of December 31, 2012.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{(dollar amounts in millions)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Assets} \\
\hline Cash and due from depository institutions: & \\
\hline Noninterest-bearing balances and currency and coin & \$3,356 \\
\hline Interest-bearing balances & 124,155 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Securities:} \\
\hline Held-to-maturity securities & 8,205 \\
\hline Available-for-sale securities & 88,405 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Federal funds sold and securities purchased under agreements to resell:} \\
\hline Federal funds sold in domestic offices & 17 \\
\hline Securities purchased under agreements to resell & 1,290 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Loans and lease financing receivables:} \\
\hline Loans and leases held for sale & 0 \\
\hline Loans and leases, net of unearned income & 27,994 \\
\hline Less: Allowance for loan and lease losses & 243 \\
\hline Loans and leases, net of unearned income and allowance & 27,751 \\
\hline Trading assets & 4,936 \\
\hline Premises and fixed assets (including capitalized leases) & 1,198 \\
\hline Other real estate owned & 4 \\
\hline Investments in unconsolidated subsidiaries and associated companies & 1,049 \\
\hline Direct and indirect investments in real estate ventures & 0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Intangible assets:} \\
\hline Goodwill & 6,443 \\
\hline Other intangible assets & 1,454 \\
\hline Other assets & 14,180 \\
\hline Total assets & \$282,443 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Liabilities} \\
\hline Deposits: & \\
\hline In domestic offices & \$129,296 \\
\hline Noninterest-bearing & 85,272 \\
\hline Interest-bearing & 44,024 \\
\hline in foreign offices, Edge and Agreement subsidiaries, and IBFs & 110,151 \\
\hline Noninterest-bearing & 8,212 \\
\hline Interest-bearing & 101,939 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{(dollar amounts in millions)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Liabilities - Continued} \\
\hline Federal funds purchased and securities sold under agreements to repurchase: & \\
\hline Federal funds purchased in domestic offices & 2,224 \\
\hline Securitles sold under agreements to repurchase & 1,030 \\
\hline Trading liabilities & 6,967 \\
\hline Other borrowed money (includes mortgage indebtedness and obligations under capitalized leases) & 2,740 \\
\hline Subordinated notes and debentures & 1,065 \\
\hline Other liabilities & 8,917 \\
\hline Total liabilities & 262,390 \\
\hline Equity Capital & \\
\hline Perpetual preferred stock and related surplus & 0 \\
\hline Common stock & 1,135 \\
\hline Surplus (excludes all surplus related to preferred stock) & 9,725 \\
\hline Retained earnings & 9,273 \\
\hline Accumulated other comprehensive income & (430) \\
\hline Other equity capital components & 0 \\
\hline Total bank equity capital & 19,703 \\
\hline Noncontrolling (minority) interests in consolidated subsidiaries & 350 \\
\hline Total equity capital & 20,053 \\
\hline Total liabilities and equity capital & \$282,443 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Source: FFFIEC Call Report, December 2012.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Copital} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{The table below provides capltal ratios for BNY Mellon and The Bank of New York Mellon as of} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Consolidated and largest bank subsidiary capital ratios} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Consolidated capital ratios:} \\
\hline Estimated Basel Ill Tier 1 common equity ratio-Non-GAAP(a)(b) & 9.8\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Determined under Basel 1 -based guidelines (c):} \\
\hline Tier 1 common equity to risk-weighted assets ratio - Non-GAAP(b) & 13.5\% \\
\hline Tier 1 capital & 15.0 \\
\hline Total capital & 16.3 \\
\hline Leverage - guideline & 5.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{The Bank of New York Mellon capital ratios (c):} \\
\hline Tier 1 capital & 14.0\% \\
\hline Total capital & 14.6 \\
\hline Leverage & 5.4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: 2012 Annual Report.
(a) The estimated Basel Ill Tier 1 common equity ratio at Dec 31, 2012 was based on the NPFFs and final market risk rule.
(b) See "Supplemental Information - Explanation of Non-GAAP financial measures" beginning on page 105 of our 2012 Annual Report for a calculation of this ratio.
(c) When we refer to BNY Mellon's or our bank subsidiary's "Basel |" capital measures (e.g., Basel / Total capital or Basel ITier 1 capital), we mean Total or Tier 1 capital, as applicable, as calculated under the Federal Reserve's risk-based capital guidelines that are based an the 1988 Basel Accord, which is ofton referred to as "Basel"."

As of December 31, 2012, BNY Mellon and our bank subsidiaries were considered "well capitalized" on the basis of the Basel I Total and Tier 1 capital to risk-weighted assets ratios and the leverage ratio (Basel 1 Tier 1 capital to quarterly average assets as defined for regulatory purposes). At December 31, 2012,
the amounts of capital by which BNY Mellon and our largest bank subsidiary, The Bank of New York Mellon, exceed the "well capitalized" guidelines are as follows:
\begin{tabular}{lrr}
\hline (in millions) & BNY Mellon (consolidated) & The Bank of New York Mellon \\
\hline Tier 1 capital & \(\$ 10,023\) & \(\$ 7,745\) \\
Total capital & 7,023 & 4,461 \\
Leverage & 930 & 932 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: 2012 Annual Report.
The Basel I Tier 1 capital ratio varies depending on the size of the balance sheet at quarter-end and the level and types of investments. The balance sheet size fluctuates from quarter to quarter based on levels of customer and market activity. In general, when servicing clients are more actively trading securities, deposit balances and the balance sheet as a whole is higher. In addition, when markets experience significant volatility or stress, our balance sheet size may increase considerably as client deposit levels increase.

Economic Capital
BNY Mellon has implemented a methodology to quantify economic capital. We define economic capital as the capital required to protect against unexpected economic losses over a one-year period at a level consistent with the solvency of a firm with a target debt rating. We quantify economic capital requirements for the risks inherent in our business activities using statistical modeling techniques and then aggregate them at the consolidated level. A capital reduction, or diversification benefit, is applied to reflect the unlikely event of experiencing an extremely large loss in each type of risk at the same time. Economic capital requirements are directly related to our risk profile. As such, it has become a part of our internal capital adequacy assessment process and, along with regulatory capital, is a key component to ensuring that the actual level of capital is commensurate with our risk profile, and is sufficient to provide the financial flexibility to undertake future strategic business initiatives.

The framework and methodologies to quantify each of our risk types have been developed by BNY Mellon's Enterprise Risk Architecture Group and are designed to be consistent with our risk management principles. The framework has been approved by senior management and has been reviewed by the Risk Committee of the Board of Directors. Due to the evolving nature of quantification techniques, we expect to continue to refine the methodologies used to estimate our economic capital requirements.

\section*{Stress Testing}

It is the policy of BNY Mellon to perform Enterprise-wide Stress Testing at regular intervals as part of its Internal Capital Adequacy Assessment Process ("ICAAP"). Additionally, BNY Mellon performs an analysis of capital adequacy in a stressed environment in its Enterprise-Wide Stress Test Framework, as required by the enhanced prudential standards issued pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Act.

Enterprise-Wide Stress Testing performs analysis across BNY Mellon's lines of business, products, geographic areas, and risk types incorporating the results from the different underlying models and projections given a certain stress test scenario. It is an important component of assessing the adequacy of capital (as in the ICAAP) as well as identifying any high risk touch points in business activities.

Furthermore, by integrating enterprise-wide stress testing into BNY Mellon's capital planning process, the results provide a forward-looking evaluation of the ability to complete planned capital actions in a more-adverse-than-anticipated economic environment.

\section*{Funding ond Liquidity}

We fund ourselves primarily through deposits and, to a lesser extent, other borrowings, which are comprised of federal funds purchased and securities sold under repurchase agreements, payables to customers and broker-dealers, commercial paper, other borrowed funds and long-term debt. Certain other borrowings, for example, securities sold under repurchase agreements, require the delivery of securities as collateral.

BNY Mellon defines liquidity as the ability of the Parent and its subsidiaries to access funding or convert assets to cash quickly and efficiently, especially during periods of market stress. Liquidity risk is the risk that BNY Mellon cannot meet its cash and collateral obligations at a reasonable cost for both expected and unexpected cash flows, without adversely affecting daily operations or financial conditions. Liquidity risk can arise from cash flow mismatches, market constraints from inability to convert assets to cash, inability to raise cash in the markets, deposit run-off or contingent liquidity events.

Our overall approach to liquidity management is to ensure that sources of liquidity are sufficient in amount and diversity such that changes in funding requirements at the Parent and at the various bank subsidiaries can be accommodated routinely without material adverse impact on earnings, daily operations or our financial condition.

BNY Mellon seeks to maintain an adequate liquidity cushion in both normal and stressed environments and seeks to diversify funding sources by line of business, customer and market segment. Additionally, we seek to maintain liquidity ratios within approved limits and liquidity risk tolerance; maintain a liquid asset buffer that can be liquidated, financed and/or pledged as necessary; and control the levels and sources of wholesale funds.

Potential uses of liquidity include withdrawals of customer deposits and client drawdowns on unfunded credit or liquidity facilities. We actively monitor unfunded lending-related commitments, thereby reducing unanticipated funding requirements.

When monitoring liquidity, we evaluate multiple metrics in order to have ample liquidity for expected and unexpected events. Metrics include cashflow mismatches, asset maturities, access to debt and money markets, debt spreads, peer ratios, liquid assets, unencumbered collateral, funding sources and balance sheet liquidity ratios. We monitor the Basel III liquidity coverage ratio as applied to us, based on our current interpretation of Basel III. Ratios we currently monitor as part of our standard analysis include total loans as a percentage of total deposits, deposits as a percentage of total interest-earning assets, foreign deposits as a percentage of total interest-earning assets, purchased funds as a percentage of total interest-earning assets, liquid assets as a percentage of total interest-earning assets, liquid assets as a percentage of purchased funds, and discount window collateral and central bank deposits as a percentage of total deposits. All of these ratios exceeded our minimum guidelines at December 31, 2012.

We also perform liquidity stress tests to ensure BNY Mellon maintains sufficient liquidity resources under multiple stress scenarios.

Additional information related to BNY Mellon's assets, liabilities, capital and major funding sources is contained in BNY Mellon's reports filed with the SEC, including the 2012 Form 10-K, the Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q and the Current Reports on Form 8-K, available at www.bnymellon.com.

\section*{D. Description of Derivative and Hedging Activithes}

We use derivatives to manage exposure to market risk, interest rate risk, credit risk and foreign currency risk.

\section*{Hedging derwativex}

We utilize interest rate swap agreements to manage our exposure to interest rate fluctuations. For hedges of available-for-sale investment securities, deposits and long-term debt, the hedge documentation specifies the terms of the hedged iterns and the interest rate swaps and indicates that the derivative is hedging a fixed rate item and is a fair value hedge, that the hedge exposure is to the changes in the fair value of the hedged item due to changes in benchmark interest rates, and that the strategy is to eliminate fair value variability by converting fixed-rate interest payments to LIBOR.

The available-for-sale investment securities hedged consist of sovereign debt and U.S. Treasury bonds that had original maturities of 30 years or less at initial purchase. The swaps on the sovereign debt and U.S. Treasury bonds are not callable. All of these securities are hedged with "pay fixed rate, receive variable rate" swaps of similar maturity, repricing and fixed rate coupon.

The hedged fixed rate deposits have original maturities of approximately ten years and are not callable. These deposits are hedged with "receive fixed rate, pay variable" rate swaps of similar maturity, repricing and fixed rate coupon. The swaps are not callable.

The fixed rate long-term debt instruments hedged generally have original maturities of five to 30 years. We issue both callable and non-callable debt. The non-callable debt is hedged with simple interest rate swaps similar to those described for deposits. Callable debt is hedged with callable swaps where the call dates of the swaps exactly match the call dates of the debt.

In addition, we enter into foreign exchange hedges. We use forward foreign exchange contracts with maturities of nine months or less to hedge our British Pound, Euro and Indian Rupee foreign exchange exposure with respect to foreign currency forecasted revenue and expense transactions in entities that have the U.S. dollar as their functional currency.

We use forward foreign exchange contracts with remaining maturities of nine months or less as hedges against our foreign exchange exposure to Australian Dollar, Euro, Swedish Krona, British Pound, Norwegian Krone and Japanese Yen with respect to interest bearing deposits with banks and their associated forecasted interest revenue. These hedges are designated as cash flow hedges. These hedges are effected such that their maturities and notional values match those of the deposits with banks.

Forward foreign exchange contracts are also used to hedge the value of our net investments in foreign subsidiaries. These forward foreign exchange contracts usually have maturities of less than two years. The derivatives employed are designated as hedges of changes in value of our foreign investments due to exchange rates. Changes in the value of the forward foreign exchange contracts offset the changes in value of the foreign investments due to changes in foreign exchange rates.

Trading actuikies (including traing derivatives)
BNY Mellon provides a client-driven market making capability for interest rate and equity derivatives. We manage trading risk through a system of position limits, a VaR methodology based on Monte Carlo simulations, stop loss advisory triggers, and other market sensitivity measures. Risk is monitored and reported to senior management by a separate unit on a daily basis. Based on certain assumptions, the VaR methodology is designed to capture the potential overnight pre-tax dollar loss from adverse changes in fair values of all trading positions. The calculation assumes a one-day holding period for most instruments, utilizes a \(99 \%\) confidence level, and incorporates the non-linear characteristics of options. The VaR model is one of several statistical models used to develop economic capital results, which is allocated to lines of business for computing risk-adjusted performance.

As the VaR methodology does not evaluate risk attributable to extraordinary financial, economic or other occurrences, the risk assessment process includes a number of stress scenarios based upon the risk factors in the portfolio and management's assessment of market conditions. Additional stress scenarios based upon historic market events are also performed. Stress tests, by their design, incorporate the impact of reduced liquidity and the breakdown of observed correlations. The results of these stress tests are reviewed weekly with senior management.

\section*{Counterporty credit rusk and collateral}

We assess credit risk of our counterparties through regular examination of their financial statements, confidential communication with the management of those counterparties and regular monitoring of publicly avallable credit rating information. This and other information is used to develop proprietary credit rating metrics used to assess credit quality. Collateral requirements are determined after a comprehensive review of the credit quality of each counterparty. Collateral is generally held or pledged in the form of cash or highly liquid government securities. Collateral requirements are monitored and adjusted daily.

Additional information related to BNY Mellon's use of derivative instruments is containe d in BNY Mellon's reports flled with the SEC, including the 2012 Form 10-K, the Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q and the Current Reports on Form 8-K, available at wWw.bnymellon.com.
E. Memberships in Waterial Payment, Clearing and Sethement Systems

BNY Mellon utilizes payment, clearing and settlement systems to conduct financial transactions in a
global economy. These systems are also known as Financial Market Utilities ("FMUs"). FMUs allow BNY
Mellon to provide payment services to customers and clients and facilitate the clearing and settlement
of customer security, derivative and cash transactions. The following is a list of BNY Mellon's
memberships in material payment, clearing and settlement systems:

F. Description of Foreign Operations

Our primary international activities consist of securities services and global payment services in our Investment Services business, and asset management in our Investment Management business.

We conduct business through subsidiaries, branches, and representative offices in 35 countries. We have operational centers based in Brussels, Cork, Dublin, Wexford, Luxembourg, Singapore, Wroclaw, throughout the United Kingdom including London, Manchester, Brentwood, Edinburgh and Poole, and Che nnai and Pune in India.

At December 31, 2012, we had approximately 9,300 employees in Europe, the Middle East and Africa, approximately 9,900 employees in the Asia-Pacific region and approximately 800 employees in other global locations, primarily Brazil.

Additional information related to BNY Mellon's international operations is contained in BNY Mellon's reports filed with the SEC, including the 2012 Form 10-K, the Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q and the Current Reports on Form 8-K, available at www.bnymellon.com.

\section*{G. Material Gupervisory Authorities}

BNY Mellon is regulated as a bank holding company and a financial holding company under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act and by the Dodd-Frank Act. We are subject to the supervision of the Federal Reserve.

The Bank of New York Mellon, which is BNY Mellon's largest bank subsidiary, is a New York state chartered bank, a member of the Federal Reserve System and subject to regulation, supervision and examination by the Federal Reserve and the New York State Department of Financial Services. BNY Mellon's national bank subsidiaries, BNY Mellon, National Association and The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, National Association, are chartered as national banking associations and subject to primary regulation, supervision and examination by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

We operate a number of broker-dealers that engage in securities underwriting and other broker-dealer activities in the United States. These companies are broker-dealers registered with the SEC and members of Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Inc., a securities industry self-regulatory organization. BNY Mellon's non-bank subsidiaries engaged in securities-related activities are regulated by supervisory agencies in the countries in which they conduct business. Certain of BNY Mellon's public finance and advisory activities are regulated by the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board. Certain of BNY Mellon's subsidiaries are registered with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (the "CFTC") as commodity pool operators or commodity trading advisors and, as such, are subject to CFTC regulation. BNY Mellon also has a subsidiary that clears futures and derivatives trades on behalf of institutional clients and is registered with the CFTC as a futures commission merchant and is a member of the National Futures Association. The Bank of New York Mellon provisionally registered as a Swap Dealer (as defined in the Dodd-Frank Act) with the CFTC, through the National Futures Association. As a Swap Dealer, The Bank of New York Mellon is subject to regulation, supervision and examination by the CFTC.

Certain of our subsidiaries are registered investment advisors under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 , as amended, and as such are supervised by the SEC. They are also subject to various U.S. federal and state laws and regulations and to the laws and regulations of any countries in which they conduct business. Our subsidiaries advise both public investment companies, which are registered with the SEC under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the " 40 Act"), including the Dreyfus family of mutual funds, and private investment companies which are not registered under the ' 40 Act.

Certain of our investment management, trust and custody operations provide services to employee benefit plans that are subject to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, administered by the U.S. Department of Labor.

Certain of our financial services operations in the UK are subject to regulation by and supervision of the Financial Conduct Authority ("FCA") and the Prudential Regulation Authority ("PRA"), whose functions were transferred to them from the previous Financial Services Authority effective April 1, 2013. The PRA is responsible for the authorization and prudential regulation of firms that carry on PRA-regulated activities, including banks. PRA-authorized firms are also subject to regulation by the FCA for conduct
purposes. In contrast, FCA-authorized firms (such as investment management firms) have the FCA as their sole regulator for both prudential and conduct purposes. As a result, FCA-authorized firms must comply with FCA prudential and conduct rules and the FCA's Principles for Businesses, while dualregulated firms must comply with the FCA conduct rules and FCA Principles, as well as the applicable PRA prudential rules and the PRA's Principles for Businesses.

The PRA regulates The Bank of New York Mellon (International) Limited, our UK chartered bank, as well as the UK branches of The Bank of New York Mellon and The Bank of New York Mellon SA/NV. Certain of BNY Mellon's UK incorporated subsidiaries are authorized to conduct investment business in the UK. Their investment management advisory activities and their sale and marketing of retail investment products are regulated by the FCA. Certain UK investment funds, including BNY Mellon Investment Funds, are registered with the FCA and are offered for retail sale in the UK.

The types of activities in which the foreign branches of our banking subsidiaries and our international subsidiaries may engage are subject to various restrictions imposed by the Federal Reserve. Those foreign branches and international subsidiaries are also subject to the laws and regulatory authorities of the countries in which the y operate.

Additional information related to BNY Mellon's supervision and regulation is contained in BNY Mellon's reports filed with the SEC, including the 2012 Form \(10-K\), the Quarterly Reports on Form \(10-Q\) and the Current Reports on Form 8-K, available at www.bnymellon.com.

\section*{H. Principal Officers}

Executive Committee and Other Executive Officers:

1. Resolution Plaming Corporate Governance Stucture and Processes

BNY Mellon has a robust governance framework to ensure that all aspects of resolution planning receive appropriate attention by designated management committees and the Board of Directors. The governance framework leverages established roles and responsibilities and committee charters for the global management of risk and incorporates enhancements designed to address resolution planning specifically, including the establishment of the Office of Recovery and Resolution Planning ("ORRP"), which is embedded within our Corporate Treasury group and is the day-to-day project manager and functional lead for oversight, development, maintenance, implementation, filing and compliance of recovery and resolution plans.

The Board of Directors has ultimate responsibility for approving our resolution plans and the Audit Committee of the Board is the primary committee designated to oversee resolution planning. The following bodies are integrally involved in our resolution planning processes and toge ther with the ORRP, the Board and the Audit Committee establish the foundation for our resolution planning governance structure:

\section*{Executive Conmmatee}

In its capacity as the most senior management committee of BNY Mellon, the Executive Committee provides strategic oversight with respect to resolution planning. The Executive Committee consists of the senior leadership of BNY Mellon and, among many other responsibilities, leads BNY Mellon strategically.

\section*{Senior Risk Monogemone Committee}

As the most senior management body responsible for evaluating emerging risk issues, the Senior Risk Management Committee directly oversees the Global Recovery and Resolution Planning Steering Committee, a committee formed specifically in connection with our recovery and resolution planning efforts.

Gobal Recovery and Resolution Planning Stearing Commhtee
The Steering Committee has primary responslbility for oversight of recovery and resolution planning at BNY Mellon. Among other responsibilities, it is tasked with establishing the project governance and oversight framework for recovery and resolution plans required by regulators in all jurisdictions where BNY Mellon operates.

\section*{Corporate Treasury}

The head of our Corporate Treasury group is the senior management official responsible for overseeing the ORRP.
J. Desciption of Material Management frfomation Systems

BNY Mellon utilizes Management Information Systems ("MIS") for risk management, accounting, financial, and regulatory reporting, as well as internal management reporting and analysis. These systems are primarily platform and mainframe technologies with interface applications that are used to collect, maintain, and report information to management and externally for regulatory compliance. The MIS are also used by BNY Mellon and its core business lines and critical operations to perform the functions necessary to run these businesses and operations. BNY Mellon's MIS generate and distribute several reports on a monthly basis that are utilized by senior management to monitor the financial health, risks, and operation of BNY Mellon and its core business lines and critical operations.

Systems and applications at BNY Mellon are essential to smooth and effective operations and are managed through a best practices Business Continuity approach. The program is built on the guiding principles of geographic diversification, separation of technology from operations, redundant and resilient telecommunications and an extensive testing program. Recovery planning is considered an integral part of BNY Mellon's approach to risk management and BNY Mellon has established formal policies, procedures, and programs for analyzing, developing, maîntaining, and testing recovery plans for all of its lines of business.

The majority of the MIS software used by BNY Mellon has been developed internally and is supplemented with third party vendor developed applications. Governance, control and maintenance of critical applications are critical components of the BNY Mellon technology process, which emphasizes minimal recovery times in the event of material financial distress or disruption.
K. High Level Description of Resolution Strategy

The Resolution Plan is designed to ensure the orderly resolution of BNY Mellon in a manner that avoids systemic risk to the U.S. financial system and the U.S. economy. The key elements of the Resolution Plan include an evaluation of the core business lines and critical operations of BNY Mellon and the design of resolution options for the entities through which these businesses and operations are conducted that ensure their continuity or orderly liquidation.

The Resolution Plan assumes an idiosyncratic event occurs, causing material financial distress or failure, and that the idiosyncratic event may occur at a time when general macroeconomic conditions are consistent with either baseline, adverse or severely adverse economic scenarios.

The Resolution Plan contemplates that in the unlikely event a resolution of BNY Mellon were necessary, the Parent would seek protection under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code. The Bank of New York Mellon, which represents the bulk of the assets and liabilities of BNY Mellon, would be recapitalized elther (i) through the entry into an FDIC receivership where the FDIC would use its traditional resolution powers including the creation of a newly chartered bridge bank to resolve The Bank of New York Mellon's core business lines and critical operations (the "Bridge Bank Strategy") or (ii) by Parent's contribution of intercompany loans, receivables and certain other assets (or otherwise converting existing deposit liabilities of the Parent placed with The Bank of New York Mellon into equity), in which case The Bank of New York Mellon would remain outside an FDIC resolution proceeding (the "SPOE Strategy"). In either case, the core business lines and critical operations would continue in operation in substantially the same manner as prior to resolution.

In the Bridge Bank Strategy, the material non-bank entities of BNY Mellon would be divested through the applicable procedure under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, or wound down in a rapid and orderly manner, if necessary, under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code.

In the SPOE Strategy, substantially all assets of the Parent, including The Bank of New York Mellon and the other material non-bank entities of BNY Mellon, would be transferred to a new, well-capitalized holding company. The Parent's material entity subsidiaries would continue their business as nonw bankrupt subsidiaries of the new holding company. Claimants in the Parent's Chapter 11 estate would ultimately receive equity in, or proceeds from the sale of, the new holding company.

Potential third-party purchasers of the businesses and operations of BNY Mellon include a range of sophisticated and diverse financial services firms.

The resolution options proposed in the Resolution Plan are designed to mitigate substantially the risk that the failure of BNY Mellon would have a serious adverse effect on financial stability in the United States. BNY Mellon believes that both the Bridge Bank Strategy and the SPOE Strategy are viable for its business model and achieve the objectives of orderly resolution. BNY Mellon believes that the Resolution Plan would result in no losses to the FDIC Deposit Insurance Fund, to the United States Department of Treasury or to depositors (domestic or foreign) and should satisfy the least-cost test in Section 13(c)(4) of the FDI Act.
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In the interest of being forthcoming with information which may affect Ms. Rodriguez's forthcoming Foreclosure Mediation, please be advised that it does not appear that my client is currently in a position to provide the required documents (certified copy of the Note, Deed of Trust, and all Assignments of Mortgage) on this file. It was my client's intention to provide the original collateral file to be reviewed at the mediation. Unfortunately, Nationstar reports that Ms. Rodriguez's collateral fle was physically moved to a new building as a part of the service transfer. Although organization of the moved flles continues, Ms. Rodriguez's file has not yet been located post-transfer.

If Ms. Rodriguez wishes to proceed with the currently scheduled mediation in order to determine whether a modification may be possibie, Nationstar will happily participate. Alternately, if the mediator and homeowner are agreeable to postponing the mediation date for 30 days in order for the collateral file to be located, Nationstar would also willingly agree to a later mediation date. In the event that Ms. Rodriguez no longer wishes to proceed, please let me know. I understand that scenarlo would likely necessitate a discussion of the terms of the cancellation with Mr. Wenzel.

Thank you,

Lindsey Bennett Morales, Esq.
Associate Attorney

McCarthy Holthus, LLP
P: (702) 685-0329
F: (866) 339-5691
Ibennett@mccarthyholthus.com
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Date Printed: 10/23/2013
Time Printed: 12:43PM
Printed By: AFIERRO

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained herein may be privileged and protected by the attorney/client and/or other privilege. It is confidential in nature and intended for use by the intended addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby expressly prohibited from dissemination distribution, copy or any use whatsoever of this transmission and its contents. If you receive this transmission in error, please reply or call the sender and arrangements will be made to retrleve the originals from you at no charge.


\section*{[Redacted]}

From: Tara Newberty [mallo:tnewbery@cnlawiv,com]
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2011 5:24 PM
To: Lindscy Eennett
Cc: adrnevada@gmall.com; Adele Newberry
Subject: RE: MatLife Home Loans v. Rodriguez | Ln\#\#

Lindsey
\begin{tabular}{|lcc|}
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At the past mediations we have requested princlpal reduction and/or interest rate reduction, and the best offer we ever racaived only lowored the payment by \(\$ 40\) and was a full recapitalization of arrearages. It went to PJR the first time (Kall Millor-Fox filed it on bohalf of your cllent) and Judge Mosley sont us back to medlation finding that the offer from your cllent was insignificant sne not in good falth, and thal the documents produced ware Insutficient to satisfy the FMP rules. Ms. Rodriguaz wants to keep the home and ultimately we are looking for a payment that is affordable. The reason this has recyclad numerous times is because your client does not have the original documents and proper assignments.

I have not yot sought sanctlons, but just wanted to advise that if the mediator's statement warrants such, we will ba filing a PJR after this mediation since this has been a repetitive problem. Additionally. my clent is contemplating iltigating a varlety of claims if wo do not reach a resolution at mediation regardless of the mediator's statement. Ms. Rodrguez received a Chapter 7 discharge and has no parsonal llablilty on the note, but would be willing to make payments again if the modification is appropriato and affordabie.

If you would like to work out an arrangement prior to medlation, we would entertain any offers your cllent may have. The property value has continued to declina since the last mediation, the area comps show that It may only be worth \(\$ 95,000\). Howover, If your client will reduce the princlpal to \(\$ 125,000\) (the FMV from the last mediation), 30 year fixed at \(4,32 \%\), It would generate an affordabie payment to resolve the foreclosure without any future litigation. This would have to be an actual pincipal reduction, not a formearance with a balloon due af the end.

Please let me know your cllent's response to our request for principal reduction, in the meantime we are collacting documents and completing the worksheots and will forward to you shortly.

Regards,

Tara D. Nowberry, Esq.
Managing Partner
ConnaghaniNewberry Law Firm
7854 W. Sahara Avanue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
(702) 608-4232
http://twitter.com/TaraNewberry
```
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\section*{tnowberryenlawiv.com \\ www, cniawiv.com}

Medlator -State of Nevada Foreciosure Mediation Program
National Assoclation of Consumer Bankruptcy Attomeys

DO NOT read, copy or disseminate this communication unless you ars the intended addressee. This e-mall communication (including any attachmants) contains confidential and/or privlieged information Intended only for the addressee, and is covered by the Electronlc Communlcations Privacy Act, \(i 8\) U.S.C. 2510-2521. If you have recelved this communlcation In error, pleasa roply to this e-mail, or call us immediately at (702) 608-4232, and ask to speak to the sender of the communlcation. Thank you. Connaghan|Nowberry Law Firm

From: Lindsey Eennett Imallto:IbonnettemeCarthyHolthus.com]
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2011 5:08 PM
To: Tara Newborry
Cc: adrnevada@gmall.cam
Subject: MetLifo Home Loans v, Rodrlguez | Ln\# wnmand 4520

Hi Tara,

Please be advisadi am the attorney who will be handling this medlation on behalf of the lender. Ploaso zubmit a complete financial package for your clent at your earliest convenience (the compiete llst of needed docs is attached). Additionally, would you please lot me know what your cllont's intenlions towards thls property are? I understand thls is the third mediation to be held regarding Ms. Rodriguez's loan and am Interested in knowing what outcome she expects and what outcome she would idesally ilke to soo.

Thanks,

Lindsey Bennett Morales, Esq.
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Associate Attorney
MeCarthy Holthus, LLP
P: (702) 686-0329
F: (866) 339.5691
lbonnett@mcearthyholthus.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained harein may be privileged and protected by the attorney/client and/or other privilege. It is confldentlal in nature and Intended for use by the intended addressee only. If you are not the Intended reciplent, you are hereby expressly prohibited from dissemination distribution, copy or any use whatsoover of this transmission and its contents. If you receive this transmission in error, please reply or call the sender and arrangements will be made to rotriove the originals from you al no charge.
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McCARTHY \& HOLTHUS, LLP
Lindsey Bennett Morales, Esq. (NSB 11519)
9510 W. Sahara Ave, Suite 110
Las Vegas, NV 89117
Telephone: (702) 685-0329
Facsimile: (866) 339-5691
Attorney for The Bank of New York Mellon \(\mathrm{f} / \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{a}\) The Bank of New York
\begin{tabular}{l|l} 
APN: 125-20-212-037 & Mediation: \\
Catherine Rodriguez & Date: October 6,2011 \\
6845 Sweet Pecan Street & Time: 1:00 PM \\
Las Vegas, NV 89149 & Location: \\
Trustee: Quality Loan Service & \\
TS NO.: NV-10-351356-NF & \\
Loan Number: \(* * * 4520\) &
\end{tabular}

Estimated Property Value: \(\$ 98 \mathrm{~K}-\$ 139 \mathrm{~K}\)
Estimated Short Sale that Bank may be willing to consider: \(\$ 118,400\) plus Broker Expenses, payoff of Junior and Super Priority Liens if applicable, etc.
UPB: \(\$ 269000.00\) Interest Rate \(5.62500 \%\) Contractual due date: 12/1/2009
Current P\&I: \$1547.17

\section*{Proposal/s:}
1. Upon confirming occupancy of subject property and identity, Borrower to vacate by date certain, determined to be one day prior to an agreed upon foreclosure sale date, in exchange for cash for keys in an amount to be determined based upon date of sale;
2. Possible acceptance of short sale offer if submitted in reasonable period of time after mediation ( lBD at mediation) by a licensed real estate broker. NOTE - shuuld burnower choose to pursuc short sale, all junior liens will need to be addressed by the borrower of his agent and may not agree to a short sale unless fully compensated or otherwise accommodated.
3. Review for trial modification, subject to income and valuc verification with payments to be determined upon receipt of financials.
4. Possibie repayment plan whereby Borrower is permitted additional time to bring the loan current.

\section*{EVALUATIVE METHODOLOGY;}

Analysis will begin by determining the borrower's intention with respect to continued ownership/occupation of the subject property.

Should it be determined that the borrower is no longer intending to retain property or cannot afford to do so under even a modified payment if available, evaluation of the feasibility of either a Short Sale or possible Deed in Lieu program will be discussed. Evaluation will first center on the presence of any junior liens on the property which would need to be addressed and/or may not agree to either program unless paid off or otherwise settled. The borrower will need to employ the services of a licensed real estate broker/agent to assist him to propose a list price to be submitted to MetLife Home Loans a division of MetLife Bank NA. for approval. If approved, MetLife Home Loans a division of MetLife Bank NA. may require review of the Broker's Fee Arrangement and will set a tentative deadline for the submission of offers on the property.

If it is the borrower's desire to retain the property, the borrower's financial situation will be evaluated to determine if the default is able to be cured via either utilizing liquid assets of the borrower and/or making a forbearance/repayment agreement whereby the borrower can cure the default while making ongoing monthly payments. Such plans may involve a down payment of a portion of the current arrearage on the loan by the borrower and may involve a stipulation to modify if the down payment and a trial repayment is complied with.

If it is determined that the borrower is unable to inake payments at the current annount and is unable to otherwise cure the default, evaluation for the feasibility of a loan modification will commence, assuming that the borrower has provided, at the very least, the Financial Statement and Housing Affordability Worksheet required by the Mediation Program. If adequate financial information including the statement and worksheet along with the requisite proof of income such as two paystubs, a tax return, and possibly bank statement/s, additional time for evaluation may be requested to perform an adequate evaluation of the borrower for modification.

Evaluation for a loan modification will first center around qualification under the Federal Home Affordable Modification Program ("HAMP"). A determination of both the Beneficiary's participation in the program and the eligibility of the borrower's loan for the program will first need to be made pursuant to the program guidelines as published and interpreted by the Treasury. As set forth in the Treasury's HAMP interpretation, a determination of \(31 \%\) of the borrower's gross income will be made, and if the existing monthly PITIA payment on the home for the first mortgage is at an amount greatcr than the \(31 \%\) of gross income determination, the evaluation for IAMP will be able to proceed. Evaluation requires the running of a Net Present Value calculation and verification of the income represented at the mediation, whether limited to oral statements or the mediation forms. Additionally, MetLife Home Loans a division of MetLife Bank NA. may require that the borrower complete and return modification application forms including but not limited to a Hardship Affidavit, Homeowner Financial Worksheet and Third Party Authorization.

If it is determined that the borrower may qualify for a HAMP-based modification, and upon review of the financials, a trial plan may be proposed whereby the borrower makes a set number of trial payments (typically three) in certified payments, which if timely, the borrower will be reviewed again for a permanent modification which may involve the lowering of the contractual interest rate, and the possible extension of the loan term. In limited instances, the forbearance or forgiveness of principle may be appropriate if required under the HAMP program.

In the instance that the borrower does not qualify for a HAMP-based modification, MetLife Home Loans a division of MetLife Bank NA. will evaluate the borrower for an internal modification. Such internal programs typically involve a forbearance or repayment program initially, as discussed above, and will likely center around the reduction of the contractual interest rate to lessen the monthly payments for a set number of monthly payments.

Dated: October 24, 2013
/s/ Lindsey Bennet Morales
MetLife Home Loans a division of MetLife Bank by its Authorized Representative
Lindsey Bennett Morales, Esq.
McCarthy \& Holthus, LLP








































 Dex
\(\therefore\). . .
 bedtaity














 :






 \$ubetury



\section*{thidetgontige}




- . .


























trin of frsiverito


 swed mextring


























\section*{}

































\(\ldots . . . . . . . . . . . . .\).
 adeberedrom:




: 中n :



















\section*{}





\(\qquad\)

\section*{risigyonturis:}
























列 :








dide of anguovis






\section*{}












\(\qquad\)




\section*{}

पע








\section*{genevgitanis：}




Ef sicortherime：




















的就 Theremot
 the boltas






\section*{Widaticnowno}

\section*{Tad Tmeske}


 ntape





\section*{}



\section*{}























\footnotetext{
,
 Whand
}



 Thantry













 mantiont:




万क ase ary ditye:










\section*{Thatofumedre}











\section*{Gersandatimbink.}











. . . A




\section*{}




..



Cencescontary
 ma:




















-...






 \(\qquad\)





\[
\cdots \quad \text {.......... }
\]

\section*{rainct}








 mation:

 Tuptra.





\(\therefore\). mathensin




\section*{}











```

\cdots..0

```
    को
.::

\section*{}





 delhititan



















 Mar Wir vilue tomblar Pexem





\footnotetext{


 nxatmatax,
}

3figntango

fiv Comsphated wamemat















 Hhtistientite




a









\footnotetext{



}























 \(\qquad\)


 matbernwimatas






\section*{rinh aichuthas}


स



 such fores







.

\&






 winktoy mbers:
… :Mutum:
 \(\cdots\)


























-...









A



\footnotetext{

\%


}

\section*{}


苟酸








 Tuternas
：

 Ginguterge




















\section*{}








…













\section*{}










\(\ldots\).
\(\cdots\)
\(\cdots\)
\(\because .\).
sit.

\section*{Thatsidextand}







 miduntodi:








 Hivident Tr any:






\(\because 6\),




(b)




\footnotetext{

}

4 中














… ..

-



TH Fandillat











\section*{AEaqu buixaty}





























…



\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)

\footnotetext{



}

\section*{}


 कomplotry

















 mitry whe conparye:


… ..
























10.





 (1) ated (2) atronay:











\section*{Tbosoncoments:}








 Rentuminn


























\section*{Hentombut}

















 Mex mititaty

 A












...
\(\because\)

\(\qquad\)


















\section*{}




 of he Croburas.










\section*{Taber nir captants}





TIM why














(f) :
 .













\section*{Tondentinuma}

\section*{}





















 Hubotidy of hat Comex






14







\footnotetext{




}

\section*{Tudicenexumat}






















 :










\section*{}





 hatek








 Tu








 \(\because\) :








\(\qquad\) \(\ldots . . \quad \therefore \quad . . . . . . . . . . . . .\).

\section*{Theresters}

















 सक


















\section*{}




































\section*{}




 whemdendryer















4hent







"


\[
\because x+\cdots
\]




















.....")





\(\%\) : \(\because\),
 tety



 - ......... .... \(\begin{gathered}\text {... } \\ \text { : }\end{gathered}\)

\section*{}
















. 5x4




Ty "


中A \(\because\) क




 Haterof wintax

\section*{Thaporadits}






 -17



















\footnotetext{

}


\footnotetext{
\(\because 8 \mathrm{Me}\)
}

\section*{}








\section*{}







\section*{}


























\section*{Rapkequibition}













\section*{}




\section*{wideratuctio}
 9250005 27500061












 Thisomenas











\footnotetext{

किए

}

\section*{}



















 Po
 x









\footnotetext{




}

\section*{}

\section*{}




















\section*{}

抹化的





\footnotetext{



}
．．．．

\section*{}


 \(\because\) Nembintik
cextay



```

amexicugwut

```
mbatratug:

\section*{Natianstan Wartuge Lat}

\section*{Dunionetry Capita Corporaton}

\author{
Dentserontios
}


\section*{Nationstar Montguye Moldings huc}

Gommensioct
Deporitaystiares
Warmats
praforted Stack



 of AMHi:
 inmexquaray spartely:



















\footnotetext{



}




 bitoradidom

\footnotetext{

}


\section*{soturemiprasprctes:}







\section*{}






\section*{}






解


\section*{}
 m



 Gow ato

\footnotetext{



}

Throuremsend











\section*{}




 क⿴囗十力




 aykuct

\％






\footnotetext{



}

\section*{Tasingeantens}





















© (1)












\section*{Motnoúsmants}



x



… \% \%
















 bronto






\footnotetext{
… .
\(\therefore\) 保
 \(\therefore\).
}

\section*{Tanaturnectin}












\section*{}



..... :......
- When wruamus



 , mavatimet:

\section*{}





\section*{Thucesombag}







\section*{}




\section*{}











 dadut




\section*{}
 \(\because\) 相



\section*{ngiotrertbut}



- 未
 ABGgi



















 Hotak






\(\qquad\)

\footnotetext{


为

}

\section*{}




a wyotor umbenmasere
Wh it now






\section*{Interyan:}




\section*{}





 qapistur ...


\section*{}






\section*{Thenotrydaby}



\section*{tutnueham:}




\section*{Cunuañ}
 aut wabinanis to

\(\therefore\) incirlemse




The wo



\section*{}




\section*{}






 \(\because\) ambunder


```

                                    ~..... -.......
                            \cdots....
    ```








```

Wy yhtim meftem:

```









```

.... $\because$.

```



``` T25 milum gemán
```











[^0]
## tigntratatis














## Madpathon











$\therefore \therefore$. Indothe



 बxum min doter cevitico




[^1]
## 



… $\because .$. .




 क्यक





 duputithatars



## 



 dunc:








$\qquad$

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

> NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC; AND THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON F/K/A THE BANK OF NEW YORK AS TRUSTEE FOR THE HOLDERS OF THE CERTIFICATES, FIRST HORIZON MORTGAGE PASS-THROUGH CERTIFICATES SERIES PHAMS 2005-AA5, BY FIRST HORIZON HOME LOANS, A DIVISION OF FIRST TENNESSEE BANK NATIONAL MASTER SERVICER, IN ITS CAPACITY AS AGENT FOR THE TRUSTEE UNDER THE POOLING AND SERVICING AGREEMENT,

Appellants,
vs.
CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ,
Respondent.
Appeal from the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Clark, The Honorable Kathleen Delaney, District Judge District Court Case No. A-13-685616-J
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