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EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ,
Petitioner,
vs.
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC; METLIFE HOME LOANS; 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 FHAMS 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,

Respondents.

## OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENTS' MOTION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING

Petitioner, CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ (hereinafter "PETITIONER"), by and through her attorneys, Venicia G. Considine, Esq., of the LEGAL AID CENTER OF SOUTHERN

NEVADA, INC., and Tara D. Newberry of CONNAGHAN NEWBERRY LAW FIRM, hereby

Case No. A-13-685616-J
Dept No. XXV
oppose Respondents' request for supplemental briefing following the Order to Show Cause hearing on September 5,2013 and the evidentiary hearing that took place on November 1, 2013 and December 13, 2013.

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITLES

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner filed a Petition for Judicial Review in July 2013. An Order to Show Cause hearing was held on September 5, 2013. An evidentiary hearing was held on November 1, 2013 for half a day and continued on December 13, 2013. Prior to each of these hearings, parties on both sides had the opportunity to, and did, file motions, responses, replies, supplements, disclosures, exhibits, and reports with the court, including an exchange of documents and witnesses pursuant to NRCP 16.1 with multiple supplements by each side. At the close of the evidentiary hearing on December 13, 2013, Respondent Bank of New York Mellon, through its' attorney Kristin Schuler-Hintz, Esq., requested the opportunity to file supplemental briefs and the court instructed that a request by motion would need to be filed.

The parties had ample opportunity to make arguments over the four months between the filing of the Petition and the conclusion of the evidentiary hearing. Respondents were given Petitioner's Initial Disclosure of Documents and Witnesses, along with multiple supplements, as well as Petitioner's Request for Judicial Notice in October of 2013. Respondents did not file an objection to Petitioner's Request for Judicial Notice. Respondents never requested an opportunity to supplement their response to the Petition during the pendency of the case. The court has heard the arguments, read the pleadings, and has a complete set of exhibits to make a decision and no further briefing is necessary.

## II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

Supplemental briefs are intended to allow arguments on transactions or occurrences or events which arise after the initial pleading. NCRP 15(d), Szilagyi v. Testa, 99 Nev. 834, 673 P.2d 495 (1983). Respondents claim there has not been sufficient opportunity to brief factual issues or legal points and request this court to give time to brief it now. However, failure to file a thorough response or brief throughout this case does not mean there was no opportunity to bring
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up their arguments or claims. The OSC hearing on the Petition for Judicial Review occurred in early September. Initial disclosures were provided by Petitioner on October 10, 2013. Supplemental disclosures were provided by Petitioner on October 30, 2013, as well as a formal written request for judicial notice with thirty two (32) exhibits attached. A second supplement was provided by Petitioner on October 31, 2013. Respondents' provided initial disclosures on October 25, 2013 and supplemented their own disclosures several times, even on the day of the evidentiary hearing on December 13, 2013. Respondents did not argue at the evidentiary hearing that any of the proposed exhibits were new or never disclosed. Thus, there was ample opportunity to review the exhibits and prepare witnesses necessary to present Respondents' position on those exhibits.

Respondents admit in their motion that their response to the Petition for Judicial Review only addressed the issue of timing. See Motion pg 3 lines 23-24. Respondents claim "the parties have not briefed the factual issues covered in the evidentiary hearing" which is simply not true. Respondents failed to address the factual issues alleged in the Petition in their response, and chose to only address the issue of timeliness. The Petition on file in this matter thoroughly alleges the misconduct, fraud and egregious conduct of Respondents that was the focus of the evidentiary hearing. The failure to address any other issue in their response does not become an opportunity for multiple bites at the apple. Respondents had ample time to review the claims asserted in the Petition and the proposed exhibits, and submit briefing to the court. Furthermore, the Respondents had ample opportunity to identify and present witnesses at the evidentiary hearing to testify and/or rebut the allegations asserted in the Petition and make arguments on the evidence presented.

Respondents claim supplemental briefing is necessary on the legal standard for sanctions. However, the applicable statute allowing sanctions to be awarded in this matter, NRS $107.0865(5)$ and the case law interpreting the statute (See Leyva v. National Default Servicing Corg. 127 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 40, 255 P.3d 1275, 1278 (Nev. 2011) (citing Pasillas v. HSBC Bank, USA, 127 Nev. Adv. Op. 39, 255 P.3d 1281 (Nev. 2011)) clearly state the imposition of sanctions lies squarely upon the discretion of the district court. In the Petition, Petitioner
specifically alleges that sanctions should be imposed based on the factors set forth in Pasillas, and that Respondents should be heavily sanctioned. One of the factors identified in Pasillas and in the Petition, is the egregiousness of the conduct by the Respondent as a measure for appropriateness of sanctions. Respondents' failure to address the legal standard set forth in the Petition or to rebut Petitioner's request for Respondents to be heavily sanctioned in their Response to the Petition, does not warrant supplemental briefing.

Petitioner's analogy between sanctions and punitive damages in her closing argument at the evidentiary hearing was simply that... an analogy. At present, there is no specific formula for monetary sanctions for the court to impose in a Petition for Judicial Review related to the State of Nevada Foreclosure Mediation Program. This court is well aware of the legal standard for the imposition of sanctions based on the district court's own discretion, and additional briefing is not necessary. Petitioner made her argument for the court to consider with regard to the appropriateness of sanctions, Respondents were given the same opportunity, and in fact, had two separate attorneys make arguments on their behalf at the conclusion of the evidentiary hearing. Sanctions are up to the discretion of the court. The opportunity to aid the court in determining the weight of the evidence was presented to both parties prior to and during the hearing. Respondents produced a Nationstar employee to testify and failed to utilize the opportunity to argue the weight of the exhibits while she was on the stand. Respondents failed to ask their own witness to rebut the exhibits, especially those that were public records filed with the Securities Exchange Commission by the Respondents and admitted by judicial notice.

With regard to the allegation that Petitioner's counsel was extrapolating information from exhibits, counsel is permitted to take excerpts from exhibits in summary to illustrate points of argument. The court has the ability to review the documents cited in their entirety when determining the weight of evidence. Respondents had the same opportunity to review the documents in their entirety as they were provided prior to the hearing, starting back in early October, and address those exhibits in their summary argument.

This request for a "do-over" after the hearing is concluded is not contemplated by NCRP 15. Supplemental briefing may be reasonably allowed upon such terms as are just. NCRP 15,

Madsen Constr. Corp. V. Riverside County Mtg. \& Loan Co., 71 Nev. 356, 291 P. 2d 1056 (1955). It is not "just" to allow Respondents an opportunity to add to the record and provide a free-pass for failure to prepare properly. This court should not award Respondents with additional time to brief arguments that should have been made during the pendency of the case.

## II. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to deny the Respondents" request for supplemental briefing.

DATED this $10^{\text {th }}$ day of January, 2014.
Respectfully submitted by:

LEGAL AID CENTER OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

Is/Venicia Considine
Venicia Considine, Esq.
Nevada Bar No: 11544
LEGAL AID CENTER OF
SOUTHERN NEVADA, INC.
725 E. Charleston Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89104
Telephone: (702) 386-1070 $\times 1437$
Facsimile: (702) 388-1642
yconsidine@lacsn.org
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## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the $10^{\text {th }}$ day of January, 2014, I placed a true and correct copy of the foregoing PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENTS MOTION FOR

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING in the United States Mail in Las Vegas, Nevada with first-class postage prepaid, and via email addressed to the following:

Allison R. Schmidt, Esq.
AKERMAN SENTERFITT LLP
1160 Town Center Drive, Suite 330
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144
allison.schmidt@akerman.com
adam.crawford@akerman.com

Kristin A. Schuler-Hintz, Esq.
McCARTHY \& HOLTHUS, LLP
9510 W. Sahara Ave., Suite 110
Las Vegas, NV 89117
KHintz@mecarthyholthus.com

Is/ Susan J. Moen
An employee of Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc.

ORDR
Venicia Considine, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 11544 LEGAL AID CENTER OF SOUTHERN NEVADA, INC. 725 E. Charleston Blvd. Las Vegas, NV 89104
Telephone: (702) 386-1070 $\times 1437$
Facsimile: (702) 386-1437
vconsidine@lacsn.org
'Tara D. Newberry
Nevada Bar No. 10696
CONNAGHAN NEWBERRY LAW FIRM
7854 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89117
Telephone: (702) 608-4232
Facsimile: (702) 946-1380
tnewberry@cnlawlv.com
Attorneys for Petitioner Catherine Rodriguez
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

## CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ,
Petitioner,
vs.

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC; METIJFE HOME LOANS; 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 FHAMS 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,

Respondents.

Case No. A-13-685616-J

Dept No. XXV

## ORDER DENYING RESPONDENTS ${ }^{\text {P MOTION FOR }}$

## SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING

Respondents 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 FHAMS 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 SERVICNG AGREEMENT, appearing by and through their counsel Ariel E. Stern and Allison Schmidt of AKERMAN LLP and Kristin A. Schuler-Hintz of McCARTHY + HOLTHUS, LLP brought this "Motion for Supplemental Briefing" on for hearing before this Court on January 14, 2014. Petitioner CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ appeared by and through counsel, Tara D. Newberry of CONNAGHAN NEWBERRY LAW FIRM and Venicia G. Considine of LEGAL AID CENTER OF SOUTHERN NEVADA, INC. The Court, having read the Motion, the Opposition, the Reply, the file, and the pleadings herein, and having heard and considered the arguments of the parties hereby FINDS and ORDERS as follows:

The Motion is DENIED.
The Court further ORDERS the parties to submit Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law to this Court by February 7, 2014.

DATED this $10^{+4}$ day of February, 2014.
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Respectfully Submitted by:

TARA D. NEWBERRY, ESQ.
CONNAGHAN \& NEWBERRY LAW FIRM
Nevada Bar No. 10696
7854 W. Sahara Ave.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

VENICIA G. CONSIDINE, ESQ
LEGAL AID CENTER OF
SOUTHERN NEVADA INC.
Nevada Bar No. 11544
725 E. Charleston Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89104

Approved as to Form:


AKERMAN LLP
Nevada Bar No, 8276
1160 Town Center Drive, Suite 330
Las Vegas, NV 89144

KRISTIN SCHULER-HINTZ, ESQ.
MCCARTHY * HOLTHUS LLP
Nevada Bar No. 7171
9510 W. Sahara, Suite 110
Las Vegas, NV 89117

FFCO

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

## CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ,
Petitioner,
vs.
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 FHAMS 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,

Respondents.

## FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

THIS COURT, having conducted a hearing on September 5, 2013, and evidentiary hearings on November 1, 2013 and December 13, 2013, as provided by NRS Chapter 107 and the Foreclosure Mediation Rules ("FMR") adopted by the Nevada Supreme Court for the Nevada Foreclosure Mediation Program (the "Program"), for the limited purposes of determining the compliance by the owner of the loan and beneficiary of the deed of trust, in attending the mediation, having authority or access to a person with authority, bringing to mediation each document required, and participating in the mediation in good faith, compliance with the rules of the Program, enforcing agreements made between parties within the Program, including temporary agreements, and determining appropriate sanctions, pursuant to FMR and the Court's Order to Show Cause dated July 23, 2013, and good cause appearing; the Court hereby finds, concludes and orders as follows:
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## FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On or about October 21, 2013, the parties stipulated that Nationstar Mortgage LLC, as servicer, was acting as the agent of The Bank of New York Mellon at the October 6, 2011, foreclosure mediation and that this court has jurisdiction over both Nationstar Mortgage LLC and The Bank of New York Mellon, pursuant to NRS 107.086(5).
2. Respondent Nationstar Mortgage LLC attended Mediation on October 6, 2011, overseen by Mediator, Steve E. Wenzel, and that this was the third mediation attended by Petitioner, Petitioner's attorney Tara D. Newberry, Esq, and McCarthy Holthus, LLP as attomey for entities claiming authority over Petitioner's mortgage.
3. Petitioner filed a Chapter 7 Bankruptcy on May 20, 2008 and was discharged on December 1, 2008. Case \#08-15209-lbr.
4. An Assignment of Deed of Trust was recorded with the Clark County Recorder's office on June, 16, 2010, assigning Petitioner's mortgage to The Bank of New York Mellon f/k/a The Bank of New York as Trustee.
5. Respondent MetLife Home Loans appeared at mediation on July 19, 2010, as an agent on behalf of The Bank of New York Mellon.
6. Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon, by and through its servicing agent, Respondent Metlife Home Loans, filed a Petition for Judicial Review on August 11, 2010, after the first mediation, which resulted in a finding by the Honorable Donald M. Moseley that the beneficiary failed to bring all required documents and lacked authority, thercby ordering a letter of certification to not be issued by the Foreclosure Mediation Program.
7. Respondent MetLife Home Loans appcared at the December 10, 2010, mediation which resulted in a finding by the mediator that the beneficiary failed to provide proper documentation according to the Foreclosure Mediation Rules.
8. Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon, by and through its servicing agent, Respondent MetLife Home Loans, provided certifications for the Promissory Note
and Deed of Trust on or about November 16, 2010, indicating that MetLife was in actual possession of the original note, and that the copy of the note attached to the certification was a true and correct copy of the original.
9. Respondent Nationstar Mortgage, LLC, appeared at the October 6, 2011 mediation and presented a Promissory Note, consisting of a copy of the Note with an endorsement to Nationstar Mortgage, LLC. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 74, lines 23-25.)
10. Respondent Nationstar Mortgage, LLC held themselves out as the new owner of Petitioner's loan at the mediation by presenting the Promissory Note, and by stating during mediation that Nationstar Mortgage, LLC was both the servicer and owner of the loan. (Nov 1st hearing, page 31, line 23 through page 35, line 2; Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 165, lines 5-10.)
11. The October 6, 2011, mediation resulted in a finding by the mediator that Respondents failed to provide all required documents required by the Foreclosure Mediation Rules.
12. Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon filed a Verified Complaint for Judicial Foreclosure and Deficiency Judgment of Deed of Trust against Petitioner on May 3, 2012, which included a copy of Petitioner's Promissory Note payable to First Horizon Home Loan Corporation with no endorsements.
13. Petitioner filed a Motion to Cancel Lis Pendens and Dismiss Complaint on December 7, 2012.
14. Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon filed a Verified Amended Complaint for Judicial Foreclosure and Deficiency Judgment of Deed of Trust against Petitioner on December 14, 2012, with a copy of Petitioner's Promissory Note payable to First Horizon Home Loan Corporation, but included a blank endorsement with a rectangular block to the right of the blank space.
15. Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon filed a Motion for Summary Judgment against Petitioner on April 29, 2013.
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16. A hearing was held on the Motion for Summary Judgment on June 18, 2013, resulting in a denial of summary judgment without prejudice.
17. The mediations held previous to the October 6,2011 mediation, and the subsequent judicial foreclosure, along with all of the documents provided by Respondents in those cases, are relevant as they illustrate a pattern of practice by Respondents and give a full picture of this loan and the circumstances surrounding the loan as it relates to the foreclosure mediation on October 6, 2011. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 138, lines 15-19.)
18. The original Promissory Note includes an endorsement in blank surrounded by a clear and distinct red circle, and there are no hole punches in the original note. (Nov. $I^{s t}$ hearing, page 70, lines 4-7.)
19. Upon inspection of the Original Note, the Collateral File, testimony provided by Faye Janati, and statements made by Respondents' counsel, the Certification executed on November 16, 2010 by Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon, by and through its agent, MetLife Home Loans, was made falsely, as the copy attached to the certification was not a true and correct copy of the original, and the affiant was not in possession of the original note. (Dec $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 9 line 18-2, page 10 lines 12-1, page 12 lines 2-8, page 54 line 8-11, page 137 line 18 through page 138 line 5,page 140 line 25 though page 177 line 16, page 195 lines 5-10.)
20. The endorsement provided in the Amended Complaint overlays the endorsement provided in the October 6,2011 , mediation exactly, except the visible rectangular white text box block in the Amended Complaint endorsement exactly blocks out the "Nationstar Mortgage, LLC" wording on the endorsement provided at the 2011 mediation.
21. Respondent Nationstar Mortgage, LLC was aware of the altered endorsements between the documents, as referenced above, as were its attorneys, McCarthy \& Holthus LLP, who concurrently represented Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon prior to the mediation on October 6, 2011. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing page 162 line 18 through page 163 line 2.)
22. Respondents, by and through Nationstar Mortgage, LLC, did not investigate how the altered endorsement was created. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 39 lines 6 21, pages 66-67 lines 5-25 \& 1-19, page 68 lines 3-9.)
23. Respondents, by and through Nationstar Morigage, LLC, disregarded issues of bad faith in the handling of Petitioner's loan, evidenced by the altered Promissory Note's creation and use, and failed to correct the misrepresentation near the time of the October 6, 2011, mediation.
24. Since the October 6, 2011, mediation, Respondents have continued to fail to investigate how the altered Promissory Note was created, who created it, and to create a process to ensure that such bad faith would not be repeated. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 39 lines 6-21, page 58 lines 12-16, pages $66-67$ lines $5-25 \& 1-19$, page 68 lines 3-9.)
25. The only evidence of movement of the Collateral File from the Custodian after August 29, 2005 is the Bailee Letter dated June 5, 2013, showing that the Collateral File was transferred to McCarthy \& Holthus LLP. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, pages 149-150. page 152, lines 6-13.)
26. Respondents attorney did not have the Collateral File prior to or during the October 6, 2011 mediation. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 171.)
27. The pattern and practice of Respondents is to have their attorneys oblain copies of notes from an imaging file when preparing documents for mediation and exhibits for filing in court, rather than making actual copies of the original for such use. (Nov. $1^{s t}$ hearing, page 64, lines 20-22; Dec $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 9, line 18-22, page 10 lines 12-17, page 12 lines $2-8$, page 54, line 8-11, page 137. line 18, through page 138, line 5, page 140, line 25, though page 177, line 16, page 195 lines 5-10.)
28. The Collateral File holding the original Promissory Note with endorsement and Deed of Trust was not used to create any of the copies Respondents sent to Respondent's counsel in preparation for any of Petitioner's mediations or the filing of the Judicial Foreclosure. (Nov. $1^{s t}$ hearing, page 64, lines 20-22; Dec $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 9
line 18-2, page 10 lines $12-1$, page 12 lines 2-8, page 54 line 8-11, page 137 line 18 through page 138 line 5,page 140 line 25 though page 177 line 16, page 195 lines 5-10.)
29. The documents presented by Respondents in Petitioner's multiple mediations and judicial foreclosure were various versions of copies taken from an imaging system and were never verified against the original documents in the Collateral File. (Nov. 1 hearing, page 64 lines $9 \cdots 12,15 \cdots 17$, page 65 lines 3-10, pages $66-67$ lines $21-$ $25 \& 1$. Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 159, lines 3-14, Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 161, lines 20 24, page 162, lines 15-17.)
30. Respondents failed to provide a qualified witness to testify as to Petitioner's specific account history, (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 20-23, pages 42-43, lines11-25\& $1-18$, page 47 lines 23-25, page 50 lines 8-14, page 51 lines 6-7.)
31. Respondents failed to produce Daniel Marks as a witness at any of the evidentiary hearing dates in this matter. Daniel Marks, who appeared at the October 6, 2011, mediation as representative of Respondents, is still currently employed by Respondent Nationstar Mortgage LLC. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing pg. 58 line 1-5.)
32. Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon is the owner of the Note, as Fay Janati testified on two different occasions. (Nov. $1^{\text {st }}$ hearing, page 62 lines 21-23; Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 13, lines 7-11.)
33. Respondent Nationstar Mortgage, LLC has a Document Execution department whose purpose is to provide documents to foreclosure attorneys. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 23, lines 18-25.)
34. Respondents, by and through Nationstar Mortgage, LLC, admitted to creating the altered endorsement. (Dec. $13^{3 / h}$ hearing, page 40 lines $6-7$. )
35. The certifications presented at Petitioner's Mediation on December 10, 2010, were printed off an imaging system and did not contain the endorsement in blank from First Horizon, yet the original Promissory Note, with an endorsement in blank, had been received by the Custodian in possession of the Collateral File on August 29, 2005, according to the First Morizon Document Header contained in the Collateral File and as
supported by testimony during the evidentiary hearing. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 145 , lines 6-7.)
36. Respondents admit Petitioner's loan was not treated any differently than other loans serviced by Nationstar Mortgage, LLC (Nov. I hearing, page 64, lines 1-2.)
37. Respondent Nationstar Mortgage, LLC does not pay additional fees to the law firms processing the foreclosure even in cases where additional documents or work is necessary. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 52 lines 8-18.)
38. Respondents knew original documents were not going to be provided for the October 6, 2011 mediation and, instead, created their own set of documents and certifications to lead Petitioner and the Foreclosure Mediation Program to believe that the documents were compliant with the Foreclosure Mediation Program Rules. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, pages 76 , lines $16-25$, page 77 , lines 1-8, page 79, lines 24-25, page 80, lines I6, page 83, lines $2-4 \& 22-25$, page 84, line 1, page 91 lines 8-16, page 94, lines 17-25, page 95, lines 1-2, page 121 lines 19-25, page 122, lines 1-16.)
39. Respondents were prepared to execute certifications stating possession of original documents when in fact, neither Nationstar Mortgage, LLC nor their attorneys were in possession of the originals and had already stated they would not be in possession of the originals by the October 6, 2011 mediation. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 100 lines 11 24, pages 101-102 lines $20-25$ \& 1-25.)
40. The law firm for Respondents prepared and generated the documents and certifications for the purposes of foreclosure mediation. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 139 , lines 13-25, page 140, lines 1-4.)
41. Respondents practice is to alter certifications to state "the attached is a copy of the original, a certified copy of which is in the possession of the undersigned" when they are unable to meet the requirements of the Foreclosure Mediation Program Rules, and unable to aver they are in possession of the original as required by the rules, in order to obtain a foreclosure certificate. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 102, lines 17-25, page 104, lines 23-25, page 105, lines 1-8, page 122, line 25, page 123, lines 1-6.)
42. Respondents presented documents at the October 6, 2011 mediation which Respondents knew were inconsistent with prior versions. (Dec. 13 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 107109 lines 24-25, 1-25, \& 1-4, page 111-113 lines 25, 1-25 \& 1-2)
43. Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon knew that Respondent Nationstar Mortgage LLC was acting on its behalf, as evidenced by the Pooling and Servicing Agreement, Master Servicing Agreement and Sub-Servicing Agreement it contractually entered and thereby delegated authority to Nationstar Mortgage LLC, as agent of The Bank of New York Mellon.
44. There is a significant difference between the original Promissory Note and the alleged certified copies in this case; since the Custodian was in possession of the original Promissory Note with an endorsement on August 29, 2005 according to the First Horizon Document Header contained in the Collateral File, and as supported by testimony during the evidentiary hearing, all other versions of the note that were produced thereafter should have contained the endorsement in blank. (Dec. $13^{\text {th }}$ hearing, page 39, lines 19-21, page 145, lines 6-7, page 151 lines 4-11, page 94 lines 10-13.)
45. As of June 18, 2013, the original Promissory Note had an endorsement in blank with a distinct red circle around it, and, while there is no evidence of when the red circle was drawn around the endorsement, the Promissory Note was presented at the Motion for Summary Judgment Hearing on that date and contained the red circle and all copies of the original Promissory Note after June 18, 2013, should reflect the distinct red circle around the endorsement.
46. Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon, in its response to the Petition in this case, included altered documents regarding the Promissory Note in this matter. McCarthy \& Holthus LLP filed a response on behalf of The Bank of New York Mellon on August 13, 2013, with an exhibit containing a copy of the Promissory Note with the stamp from Old Republic Title on the first page and with an endorsement in blank that did not contain the red circle, nor did it have the "Nationstar Mortgage LLC" stamp. As testified to by attorney Kristin Schuler-Hintz, the Old Republic stamp indicatcs that it was a copy
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made at the time of closing in April of 2005, and is the version obtained from an imaging file. Despite being in possession of the original Promissory Note at some point before June 18, 2013, at which time the Promissory Note had a distinct red circle around the endorsement in blank, Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon's response to the Petition did not contain a copy of the Promissory Note as it existed on August 13, 2013. The version of the Note presented at the October 6, 2011, mediation was in fact Exhibit 1 in this matter, which contains the Nationstar Mortgage LLC stamp as Petitioner, and counsel for Respondents, Lindsey Bennett-Morales, testified, and therefore Respondents failed to include in their response the actual document it presented at mediation. (Dec 13th hearing, page 9 line 18-2, page 10 lines 12-1, page 12 lines 2-8, page 54 line 8-11, page 137 line 18 through page 138 line 5,page 140 line 25 though page 177 line 16 , page 195 lines 5-10.)
47. The exhibit attached to Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon's response in this matter, as well as Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon's Motion to Amend the Complaint filed in the Judicial Foreclosure case on September 5, 2013, containing the same inaccurate copy of the Promissory Note demonstrates a pattern and practice by Respondent and its counsel to utilize inaccurate and untrustworthy copies of documents.
48. Respondents had a financial interest and financial incentive throughout Petitioner's foreclosure process to complete the foreclosure sale. Respondents were contractually required to make advances for the payment of principal and interest, taxes and insurance and legal fees, as well as ancillary costs of foreclosure, but earned interest on these advances as amounts deposited in collection accounts referred to as float money. Respondents were in first priority for reimbursement from liquidation proceeds, also known as foreclose sale proceeds, as stated in the Prospectus dated February 25, 2005, the Pooling and Servicing Agreement dated May 1, 2005, Nationstar Mortgage LLC's Registration Statement filed with the SEC on August 11, 2011, and the Subservicing Agreement effective June 21, 2011, filed by Nationstar Mortgage LLC with the SEC.
49. Respondents had a financial interest and financial incentive throughout Petitioner's foreclosure process to complete the foreclosure sale, as it was contractually permitted to impose late payment charges and servicing fees for each month the loan remained past due, and Respondents were in first priority for recovery of those fees from liquidation proceeds, also known as foreclose sale proceeds, as stated in The Pooling and Servicing Agreement dated May 1, 2005; Nationstar Mortgage LLC's Registration Statement filed with the SEC on August 11, 2011, and such charges were assessed against Petitioner's loan as evidenced by Nationstar Mortgage LLC's Servicing records.
50. Respondents would have collected all of the monies advanced by Respondents with interest, in addition to late payment fees and servicing fees, once a foreclosure was completed and the liquidation proceeds realized.
51. Respondents' intentional use of altered documents to avoid good faith participation in the Foreclosure Mediation Program is egregious conduct.
52. Agents of Respondent The Bank New York of Mellon attended Petitioner's Mediations without proof of authority.
53. Respondents failed to provide the required documents at each of Petitioner's Mediations and refused to offer a loan modification depriving Petitioner of an opportunity to keep her home.
54. Respondents repeated violations of FMR were intentional and repetitive and caused harm to the Petitioner and to the integrity of the Foreclosure Mediation Program.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. NRS 107.086 (8)(d) requires the Supreme Court to adopt rules to establish procedures to protect the mediation process from abuse and to ensure that each party to the mediation acts in good faith.
2. NRS $107.086(4)$ and the Foreclosure Mediation Rules ("FMR") require the original or certified copy of the Promissory Note to be produced at mediation. At the time of the mediation on October 6, 2011, FMR $11(4)$ requirement that a certified copy of the
original note, and each endorsement of the note, could only be satisfied when the mediator received a statement under oath signed before a notary public that specifically states that the person making the certification is in actual possession of the original mortgage note, that the attached copy of the mortgage note is a true and correct copy of the original mortgage note, which is in the possession of the person making the certification. Respondents failed to comply with FMR 11.
3. A compliant certified copy is a copy made of the original document at the time it is being certified by an affiant. As indicated throughout the Court's finding of facts, the Respondents in this case never made an actual copy of the original for use as an exhibit in any court filing or for the purposes of certification in accordance with the FMR 11. In its response to the Petition, Respondent used a copy from its imaging file rather than making a copy of the original Promissory Note and, furthermore, failed to include the version of the Promissory Note that it presented at mediation. A copy of a copy of the Promissory Note, Deed of Trust and/or any Assignments is prima facie noncompliance with NRS 107.086(4) and FMR 11.
4. Respondents were required to mediate in good faith, provide required documents, and provide a person with authority to modify the loan or have "access at all times during the mediation to a person with such authority." NRS 107.086(4), (5); FMR $5(7)(\mathfrak{a})$. Respondents failed to mediate in good faith, failed to provide all required documents, and failed to present a person with authority.
5. The Court may issue an order imposing sanctions against the beneficiary of the Deed of Trust or the representative as the Court determincs appropriate. See FMR 5(7)(f). 8 See NRS 107.086(2)(c)(2), (3), (6), (7). Pasillas v. Hsbc Bank U.S., 2011 WL 2671894, 255 P.3d 1281, 127 Nev. Adv. Op. 39 (Nev., 2011) If the Court finds noncompliance with the requirements, the bare minimum sanction is that an FMP certificate must not issue. Holt v. Reg't Tr. Servs. Corp., 127 Nev. , ,, 266 P.3d 602, 607 (2011).
6. The nature of the sanctions imposed on the beneficiary or its representative is within the discretion of the Court. Pasillas v. HSBC Bank USA, 127 Nev . $\qquad$ 255 P.3d 1281, 1287 (2011). The Nevada Supreme Court previously listed factors to aid district courts when considering sanctions as punishment for litigation abuses, violations of Foreclosure Mediation Rules or NRS 107,080 et al, including but not limited to, the degree of willfulness of the offending party, the severity of the sanction relative to the severity of the abuse, the financial condition of the party being sanctioned and the need to deter both the parties and future litigants from similar abuses. See Young v. Johnny Ribeiro Building, 106 Nev. 88, 93, 787 P.2d 777, 780 (1990); see also Bahena v. Goodyear Tire \& Rubber Co., 126 Nev. -—, ——, 235 P.3d 592, 598-99 (2010); Arnold, 123 Nev. at 415-16, 168 P.3d at 1053 Pasillas v. Hsbc Bank U.S, 2011 WL 2671894, 255 P.3d 1281, 127 Nev. Adv. Op. 39 (Nev., 2011).
7. In Pasillas, the Nevada Supreme Court set forth a nonexhaustive list of factors for the district court to consider in weighing the appropriate sanctions to impose when a party has violated the FMP requirements. 127 Nev . at , 255 P.3d at 1287 . In light of Respondents violations of the FMR, repeated use of inaccurate copies of required documents including in its responses filed in this matter, sanctions are necessary to demonstrate to Respondents that they are not free to act with wayward disregard of Nevada law, the FMR, or the judicial system. See Foster v. Dingwall, 227 P.3d 1042 (Nev., 2010).
8. The conduct exhibited in relation to Petitioner's loan and the mediation at issue was egregious and in the consideration of imposition of sanctions, this Court finds that under NRS 107.080, FMR, and the case law of this state, that substantial sanctions are appropriate.
9. The Court concludes that since Petitioner received a discharge of liability for the Promissory Note at issue in this matter by decree of the United States Bankruptcy Court District of Nevada issued on December 1, 2008 in case \#08-15209 by the Honorable

Linda B. Riegle, there can be no offset with regard to sanctions imposed by this Court as this would be in violation of the discharge injunction.

## ORDER

## NOW THEREFORE:

THE COURT ORDERS a sanction of $\$ 50,000.00$ dollars to be imposed against Respondent The Bank of New York Mellon, payable to Petitioner within 30 days of entry of this order. Respondents shall be sanctioned an additional $\$ 5,000$ per day for failure to do so within 30 days of the entry of this order.

THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS a sanction of $\$ 50,000.00$ dollars against Respondent Nationstar Mortgage LLC payable to Petitioner within 30 days of entry of this order. Respondent shall be sanctioned an additional $\$ 5,000$ per day for failure to do so within 30 days of the entry of this order.

THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that Respondents are jointly and severally liable for Petitioner's reasonable attorney fees and costs as an additional sanction in this matter.

THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS Petitioner's counsel to file a Memorandum of Costs and Fees including all costs and fees accrued from the election of mediation in 2011 to the date of this order, such memorandum must be filed with the Court within 14 days of entry of this order. The Court shall issue a separate order regarding the total amount of fees and costs to be awarded.

THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS that a Certificate shall not issue regarding the October, 2011 mediation.
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## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

## CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ, a Nevada limited liability company,
vs.
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLD; METLIFE HOME LOANS; 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 FHAMS 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,

## Respondents.

Case No.: A-13-685616-J
Dept. No.: XXV

MOTION TO RETAX COSTS AND OBJECTION TO UNREASONABLE ATTORNEYS' FEES

Date of Hearing:
Time of Hearing:

COME NOW Respondents Nationstar Mortgage LLC ("Nationstar") and The Bank of New York Mellon $\mathrm{f} / \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{a}$ The Bank of New York as Trustee for the Holders of the Certificates, First Horizon Mortgage Pass-Through Certificates Series FHAMS 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 ("BNY Mellon") by and through its attorneys of record, the law firm of Kravitz, Schnitzer \& Johnson, Chtd., and hereby submit this Motion to Retax Costs and Objection to Unreasonable Attorneys' Fees.

This Motion is based and made upon the Memorandum of Points and Authorities submitted herewith and all arguments and evidence permitted at the hearing on this Motion.

DATED this $23^{\text {rd }}$ day of October, 2014.

KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER \& JOHNSON, CHTD.
GARY E. SCHNITZ ER, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 395
MELANIE D. MORGAN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 8215
8985 S. Eastern Ave., Ste. 200
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Tele: (702) 362-6666
Fax: (702) 362-2203
gschnitzer@ksjatorneys.com
mmorgan@ksattorneys.com
Attorneys for Respondents,
Nationstar Mortgage LLC and
The Bank of New York Mellon

## NOTICE OF MOTION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the foregoing MOTION TO RETAX COSTS AND OBJECTION TO UNREASONABLE ATTORNEYS＇FEES shall be on for hearing before the Court in Department XXV，on the 4 day of Dec．＿，2014，at the hour of $\qquad$ a．m．／p．m．，or as soon thereafter as counsel for Respondents can be heard．

DATED this 23rd day of October， 2014.

KRAVITZ，SCHNITZER \＆JOHNSON，CHTD．


GARYE．SCHNITZER，ESQ．
Nevada Bar No． 395
MELANIE D．MORGAN，ESQ．
Nevada Bar No． 8215
8985 S．Eastern Ave．，Ste． 200
Las Vegas，NV 89123
Tele：（702）362－6666
Fax：（702）362－2203
gschnitzer＠ksiattorneys．com
mmorgan＠ksjattorneys．com
Attorneys for Respondents，
Nationstar Mortgage LLC and
The Bank of New York Mellon

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I．INTRODUCTION

On October 3，2014，this Court issued a Findings of Fact，Conclusions of Law and Order whereby it ordered Petitioner＇s counsel to file a Memorandum of Costs and Fees including all costs and fees accrued from the election of mediation in 2011 to the date of the Order．On October 17，2014，Petitioner＇s Counsel filed the attached Memorandum of Costs and Fees claiming $\$ 87,095$ in fees and $\$ 3,214.11$ in costs．

As explained herein, the amount of attorneys' fees claimed by Petitioner is patently unreasonable under the factors set forth by the Nevada Supreme Court in Brunzell v. Golden Gate National Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 455 P.2d 31 (1969). In addition, the Memorandum of Costs includes cost items not recoverable pursuant to NRS 18.005, and none of the costs claimed are substantiated by supportive documents.

## II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

## Obiection to Unreasonable Attorneys' Fees

## A. The Amount of Petitioner's Attorneys' Fees is Unreasonable.

Respondents recognize that "district courts have great discretion to award attorney fees, and this discretion is tempered only by reason and fairness." Shuette v. Beazer Homes Holdings Corp., 121 Nev. 837, 864, 124 P.3d 530, 548-49 (2005). "[1]n determining the amount of fees to award, the court is not limited to one specific approach; its analysis may begin with any method rationally designed to calculate a reasonable amount," so long as the requested amount is reviewed in light of the factors set forth in Brunzell v. Golden Gate National Bank, 85 Nev . 345, 249, 455 P.2d 31, 33 (1969). Shuette v. Beazer Homes Holdings Corp., 121 Nev. 837, 864-65 (2005). The Brunzell factors are: (1) the qualities of the advocate: his ability, his training, education, experience, professional standing and skill; (2) the character of the work to be done: its difficulty, its intricacy, its importance, time and skill required, the responsibility imposed and the prominence and character of the parties where they affect the importance of the litigation; (3) the work actually performed by the lawyer: the skill, time and attention given to the work; (4) the result: whether the attorney was successful and what benefits were derived.

Here, Respondents do not dispute the training and skill of Petitioner's counsel. Respondents also recognize that this Petition is more complex than the average petition for judicial review following a foreclosure mediation. However, due to the nature of the
proceedings, there was no discovery conducted in relation to the Petition. As for the concurrent judicial foreclosure action, discovery activity was minimal with little, if any, discovery completed after the initial document and witness exchange. There were no depositions, no expert witnesses, and no jury. While the motion work exceeded that of a typical petition for judicial review, it cannot be considered excessive or even notably significant in the context of a typical civil lawsuit. While the importance of the work itself is certainly recognized by Respondents, such importance cannot provide justification for unreasonably excessive fees.

Petitioner's billing records reveal that her two lawyers would bill for the same task, and then bill for a lengthy in-person meeting to discuss those tasks among themselves. The billing entries themselves are vague, and are billed in large block-increments.

This type of vague block-billing is not consistent with the ethical guidelines propounded by the American Bar Association or by the Nevada State Bar. "Block billing" is considered an unethical billing practice where an attorney provides no description or an inadequate description of the work performed. Clients recognize block billing as a strategy to disguise inefficiency. Moreover, many courts do not permit block billing because it hinders effective reimbursement of attorneys' fees following a judgment. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals emphatically disapproves of "block billing." Welch v. Metro. Life Ins. Co., 480 F.3d 942, 948 ( $9^{\text {th }}$ Cir. 2007); Reyna v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 548 Fed. Appx. 404 ( $9^{\text {th }}$ Cir. Cal. 2013); Orloff v. UPS, 2013 U.S. App. LEXIS 26029 ( $9^{\text {th }}$ Cir. Idaho July 11, 2013).

It is appropriate for the court to reduce the total fee amount in account of impermissible block billing and excessive work. Innospan Corp. v. Shasta Ventures GP LLC, 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 12959 ( $9^{\text {th }}$ Cir. Cal. July 9, 2014). In Lahiri v. Universal Music \& Video Distrib. Corp., a Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals found it appropriate to reduce any block-billed entries by $30 \%$ and to make an across-the-board reduction of $10 \%$ for excessive and redundant work. Lahiri $v$.

Universal Music \& Video Distrib. Corp. 606 F.3d 1216, 1223 ( $9^{\text {th }}$ Cir. Cal. 2010) citing Welch v. Metro. Live Ins. Co, 480 F.3d 942, 948 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing California State Bar's Committee on Mandatory Fee Arbitration's report that block billing may increase time by 10 to $30 \%$ ); Moreno v. City of Sacramento, 534 F.3d 1106, 1112 ( $9^{\text {th }} \mathrm{Cir}$. 2008). Petitioner's fees should be reduced substantially to reflect a reasonable sum.

Although Respondents object to all block-billed and duplicative work, the below four categories of bills provide the Court with insight of the excessive nature on Petitioner's fees:

- Between August 9, 2013 and October 15, 2013, Petitioner's counsel billed 22.8 hours exclusively for in-person meetings with one another. This does not include hours of telephone calls and e-mail exchanges. This also does not include meetings with opposing counsel for document/evidentiary purposes. There is no explanation in either the affidavits submitted or in the billing entries themselves explaining why such extensive face-to-face meetings among counsel were required. Respondents submit that 22.8 hours for in-person meetings among counsel is excessive and request that this amount be reduced significantly. (Exhibit A, Table 1).
- After billing 19 hours for preparation for the first evidentiary hearing (this does not include numerous hours billed for research), Petitioner's counsel billed another 34.4 hours on preparation for the continued evidentiary hearing. Importantly, nothing about the case changed from the first hearing to the second. The hearing was continued because the Court had a bench trial scheduled for the afternoon of November 1, 2013, and could not complete the evidentiary hearing in one day.

Respondents submit that 53.4 hours for preparation alone is unreasonable and excessive. When added to the 22.8 hours for meetings, Petitioner's counsel billed a staggering 79.8 hours for nothing other than preparation and in-person meetings. Again, this does not include drafting of briefs or research. (Exhibit A, Table 2).

- On January 3, 2014, Respondents' counsel filed a four-page Motion for Supplemental Briefing. Thereafter, Petitioner's counsel billed 5 hours simply for an in-person meeting to discuss their Opposition. This does not include time for research, time for drafting the Opposition or time for appearance at the hearing. A bill for 5 hours for a meeting to discuss a four-page motion is excessive. (Exhibit A, Table 3).
- Finally, Petitioner's counsel billed 28.5 hours for preparation of the proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. Importantly, this does not include 4.9 hours spent reviewing the transcript. Respondents submit that 28.5 hours is unreasonable and excessive. (Exhibit A, Table 4).


## Motion to Retax Costs

NRS 18.005 sets out the definition of recoverable costs. The determination of allowable costs is within the sound discretion of the trial court, and all costs must be reasonable. The Nevada Supreme Court has held that costs must be "actual and reasonable, 'rather than a reasonable estimate or calculation of such costs.'" Bobby Berosini, Ltd. v. PETA, 114 Nev. 1348, 1352, 971 P.2d 383, 385-86 (1998) (quoting Gibellini v. Klindt, 110 Nev. 1201, 1206, 885 P.2d 540, 543 (1994)).
"Demonstrating that a cost was actually incurred often requires documentation." See Village Builders 96 V. U.S. Laboratories, 121 Nev. 261, 276, 112 P.3d 1082, 1092 (2005). "[D]ocumentation is precisely what is required under Nevada law to ensure that the costs awarded are only those costs actually incurred." Gibellini, 110 Nev. at $1205-6,885$ P.2d at 543 (reversing part of an order awarding costs not documented to be actual and remanding of actual costs incurred.) However, the court has discretion to determine if an actually incurred cost was reasonable. Village Builders, 112 Nev . at. 278, 112 P.3d at 1093 . That being said, determining necessity and reasonableness may require detailed documents such as itemizations. See Berosini, 114 Nev. at 1353, 971 P.2d at 386 (determining that a prevailing party was not entitled to costs for photocopies, long distance phone calls, and juror fees where the party failed to give documentation or itemizations necessary to determine reasonableness and necessity."

Here, none of the costs are supported by documentation or invoices. Moreover, certain costs are not recoverable under NRS 18.005. Respondents dispute the following charges:

- There is no back up documentation for the $\$ 72.11$ in postage and shipping charges.
- Petitioner claims a $\$ 200$ charge for documents produced on disks. There is no indication of how many disks were produced or how much each disk cost. A simple search of Office Max shows that disks are less than $\$ 1.00$ each. (Exhibit B, Office Max printout). As such, a charge of $\$ 100$ for disks in this case is unreasonably excessive and without proper supportive documentation.
- Petitioner claims charges of $\$ 267.77$ for "Binders for Evidence/Exhibits". Again, there is no reference to how many binders were purchased, or any documentation evidencing the cost of each binder.
- Petitioner claims $\$ 88.60$ for " 10 reams of paper, monitor cables for court display for evidentiary hearing." First, Petitioner already claimed $\$ 1,323.60$ for "4x Evidentiary Exhibits", so it is unclear why Petitioner is also charging for 10 reams of paper. In addition, office supplies are not a recoverable cost pursuant to NRS 18.005. Finally, there is no documentation to support that the cost was actually incurred.

Accordingly, Respondents request that the above-listed items, totaling $\$ 628.48$, be omitted from the costs recoverable by Petitioner.

## III. CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, Nationstar and BNY Mellon respectfully request that this Honorable Court issue an order retaxing costs and reducing the attorneys' fees recoverable as set forth above.

DATED this $23^{\text {rd }}$ day of October, 2014.

KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER \& JOHNSON, CHTD.

GARYE. SCHNITZER, EsQ.
Nevada Bar No. 395
MELANIE D. MORGA(N, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 8215
8985 S. Eastern Ave., Ste. 200
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Tele: (702) 362-6666
Fax: (702) 362-2203
gschnitzer@ksjattomeys.com
mmorgan@ksjattorneys.com
Attorneys for Respondents,
Nationstar Mortgage LLC and
The Bank of New York Mellon

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 23 rd day of October, 2014, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing MOTION TO RETAX COSTS AND OBJECTION TO UNREASONABLE ATTORNEYS' FEES as follows:

Electronically pursuant to Rule 9 of the N.E.F.C.R.:
Venicia G. Considine, Esq.
LEGAL AID CENTER OF SOUTHERN NEVADA, INC. aberlin@lacsn.org
vconsidine@lacsn.org

X
By United States Postal Service, first class mail, postage prepaid:
Kristin A. Schuler-Hintz, Esq.
MCCARTHY \& HOLTHUS, LLD
9510 W. Sahara Ave., \#200
Las Vegas, NV 89117
Tara D. Newberry, Esq.
CONNAGHAN NEWBERRY LAW FIRM
7854 W. Sahara Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89117

Via Facsimile:


## EXHIBIT A

Table 1: In-Person Meetings

| Attorney | Date | Description | Time | Fee |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| VC | $8 / 9 / 13$ | Meet with Tara at her office and discussed <br> lase-discovery - ECC, JCCR, etc...Call Jan to <br> schedule ECC | 3 | $\$ 750$ |
| VC | $9 / 17 / 13$ | Meeting with Tara on settlement discussions | 1 | 3.4 |
| VC | $10 / 1 / 13$ | Meeting with Tara on evidentiary hearing | $\$ 250$ |  |
| VC | $10 / 15 / 13$ | Meeting with Tara to strategize for <br> Evidentiary Hearing on $11 / 1 / 13$ | 3 | $\$ 750$ |
| TN | $8 / 9 / 13$ | Meeting with co-counsel and client re: Judicial <br> Foreclosure case and PJR | 3 | $\$ 900$ |
| TN | $9 / 17 / 13$ | Meeting with co-counsel re: settlement <br> discussions | 1 | $\$ 300$ |
| TN | $10 / 1 / 13$ | Meeting with co-counsel to review <br> documents | $\$ 600$ |  |
| TN | $10 / 1 / 13$ |  <br> strategize evidentiary hearing | $\$ 1,020$ |  |
| TN | $10 / 15 / 13$ | Meeting with co-counsel to review evidence <br> and strategy for hearing | 22.8 | $\$ 6,320$ |

Table 2: Preparation for Evidentiary Hearing

| Attorney | Date | Description | Time | Fee |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VC | $10 / 31 / 13$ | Prep for Evidentiary Hearing | 5 | $\$ 1,250$ |
| VC | $10 / 31 / 13$ | Copy, tab exhibits, go through exhibits, prep <br> for hearing | 5 | $\$ 1,250$ |
| VC | $12 / 11 / 13$ | Prepare for hearing on Friday | 4 | $\$ 1,000$ |
| VC | $12 / 12 / 13$ | Prepare for evidentiary hearing on the 13 |  |  |
| TN | $10 / 31 / 13$ | Prepare: for Evidentiary hearing including: <br> review of ali evidence, pleadings, research <br> and preparation of exhibits | 9 | $\$ 1,750$ |
| TN | $12 / 5 / 13$ | Review: and organize evidence for hearing | 1.4 | $\$ 2,700$ |
| TN | $12 / 8 / 13$ | Prepare: for evidentiary hearing | 3 | $\$ 420$ |
| TN | $12 / 10 / 13$ | Prepare: for evidentiary hearing | 4 | $\$ 900$ |
| TN | $12 / 11 / 13$ | Prepare: for evidentiary hearing; finalizing <br> cross-examination | 6 | $\$ 1,200$ |
| TN | $12 / 12 / 13$ | Prepare: for evidentiary hearing including <br> finalizing exhibits and document excerpts for <br> closing | 9 | $\$ 1,800$ |

Table 3: In-Person Meetings to Discuss Opposition to 4-page Motion for Supplemental Briefing

| Attorney | Date | Time | Fee |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VC | $1 / 9 / 14$ | Meeting with Tara to plan opposition to <br> Motion for sup briefing | 2.5 | $\$ 625$ |
| TN | $1 / 9 / 14$ | Meeting: with co-counsel re: opposition to <br> supplemental briefing | 2.5 | $\$ 750$ |
|  |  |  | 5 | $\$ 1,375$ |

Table 4: Preparation of Proposed Findings of Fact and Concluslons of Law

| Attorney | Date | Description | Time | Fee |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VC | $1 / 16 / 14$ | Prep for FOFCOL | 7.5 | $\$ 1,875$ |
| VC | $2 / 1 / 14$ | Drafting FOFCOL | 2.8 | $\$ 700$ |
| VC | $2 / 2 / 14$ | Drafted sent to Tara for review | 3.5 | $\$ 875$ |
| VC | $2 / 3 / 14$ | Discussed flling and strategy | 1.1 | $\$ 275$ |
| TN | $1 / 16 / 14$ | Meeting w/ co-counsel to review record and <br> begin drafting FFCL | 3 | $\$ 900$ |
| TN | $2 / 2 / 14$ | Review: and revise FFCL | 4 | $\$ 1,200$ |
| TN | $2 / 3 / 14$ | Telephone Conference: with co-counsel re: <br> FFCL | 1.1 | $\$ 330$ |
| TN | $2 / 5 / 14$ | FInalize FFCL including verifying citations to <br> record | 2.5 | $\$ 750$ |

## EXHIBIT B

## Office Depot <br> OfficeMax <br> NOW ONE COMPANY

## CD-R Printable Discs

3 Results
trems 1 to 3
24 Per Page
Sort By:
Best Match
up to 4 tems


Memorex CD-R Media Spindle. Inkjet Printable, $700 \mathrm{MB} / 80$ Minutes, Pack Of 30

$\$ 1999$
/ pack
Qty

$$
\infty
$$

$\boldsymbol{V}_{\text {Sold Online }}$
Sold in stores
$\downarrow_{\text {Free in Store Pick Up (i) }}$Compare


```
Verbatim@ CD-R Printable Disc Spindie, White, Pack Of 100
            Write a review Verbatim(2) CD
        $3499
        lpack
Qty
        #
* Sold in stores
* Free in Store Pick Up(0)
```

```Compare
```



Verbatim(1) CD-R Printable Disc Spindle, White, Pack Of 50

| Write a review | Verbatim® CD-R Printable Disc Spindle, White, Pack Of 50 <br>  <br> Hern $\$ 283861$ |
| :--- | :--- |

## $\$ 2999$ <br> / pack

Qty
济
$\sqrt{\text { Sold in stores }}$
$\checkmark$ Free in Store Pick Up (0)
[,
Compare
Category Top Sellers



Memorex (Bl Slim CD Jewel Cases, Clear, Pack Of 50
$\$ 2299$ / pack



ReBinder ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ ReSleeve 100\% Recycled Cardboard CD Sleeves... \$768/ each


Office Depot ${ }^{(2)}$ Brand Color CD/DVD Envelopes, Ass orted Col... \$759/box

CD-R Printable Discs: CD-R Disk Cases at Office Depot


Momorex( Slim CD Jewel Cases, Clear, Pack Of 100 \$3309/pack


Fellowes(3) Self-Adhesiva CD Holder, Pack Of 5 $\$ 499$ / pack



Fellowes NEATO Thin CD Jewel Case-Clear, 25 pack \$895/pack


Vault ${ }^{T M}$ CD File Fokers, Pack Of 100 \$1399/pack



Memorex $B$ Standard Jewel Cases, Black, Pack Of 25 \$849/pack


Imation ${ }^{\text {TM }} 3.5^{\prime \prime}$ Diskettes, BMFormat, DSJHD, Black...
\$895/bax


TDK DVD-R Recordable Media Spindle, 4.7GB/120 Mnutes, Pack Of 100 $\$ 4499$ / pack



Office Depot(8) Brand 2-Sided CD Sleeves, 200 Capacity, Pack Of 100 \$859/pack


Verbatim DataLlePlus 95079 DVD Recordable Media - DVD-R - $1 .$. \$1595/ pack

$$
2 \text { Reviews }
$$



Memorex ${ }^{(8)}$ DVD+R Double Layer Recordable Media Spindle, 8.... \$5799/ each


Verbatim(8) Inkjet Hub Printable DVD+R DL Spindle, White, ... \$4999/pack

CD-R Printable Discs: CD-R Disk Cases at Office Depot
http://www.officedepot.com/a/browse/cd-r-printable-discs/ $\mathrm{N}=5+50 .$. .



Verbatim DataLifePlus DVD Recordable Media - DVD+R DL - 8 x -... $\$ 6795 /$ each


Verbatim(3) DVO-R Recordable Media, 4.7GB/120 Mnutes, Pack Of 10 $\$ 459 /$ each
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## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ, a Nevada limited liability company,
vs.
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC; METLIFE HOME LOANS; 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 FHAMS 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 SERVICNG AGREEMENT,

Respondents.

## NOTICE OF POSTING SUPERSEDEAS BOND FOR NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC AND THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 65(d), this Court's October 29, 2014 Order on Respondents Nationstar Mortgage LLC and The Bank of New York Mellon's Motion for Stay of Payment of Sanctions Pending Appeal, and this Court's 1

November 4, 2014 Order setting November 10, 2014 as the deadline for Respondents to post this bond without incurring additional daily sanctions, Respondents Nationstar Mortgage LLC and The Bank of New York Mellon deposited security with the Clark County Clerk in the amount of $\$ 190,310.11$ plus interest at the rate of $5.25 \%$ per annum from October 3, 2014 through the date of the posting of this bond on November 10, 2014. A copy of the Supersedeas Bond is attached hereto.
DATED this $10^{\text {th }}$ day of November, 2014.
KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER \& JOHNSON, CHTD.
GARY E. SCHNITZIER, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 395 .
MELANIE D. MORGAN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 8215
8985 S. Eastern Ave., Ste. 200
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Tele: (702) 362-6666
Fax: (702) 362-2203
gschnitzer(aksjattorneys.com
mmorgan(Oksjattomeys.com
Attorneys for Respondents,
Nationstar Mortgage LLC and
The Bank of New York Mellon

## DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK



## SUPERSEDEAS BOND

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that we, NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC and THE BANK OR NEW YORK MELLON, as Principals, and, ARGONAUT INSURANCE COMPANY, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of ILLINOIS, and duly authorized to transact business in the State of NEVADA as Surety, are held and firmly bound unto DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, CLARK COUNTY, in the penal sum of ONE HUNDRED NINETY THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED TEN AND 11/100 DOLLARS (U S\$190,310.11), lawful money of the United States, to the payment of which well and truly to be made we hereby bind ourselves and our heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

WHEREAS, judgment was signed in this case in favor of CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ, Petitioner, and against NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC and THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON, Respondents, for damages in the sum of $\$ 50,000.00$ per Respondent, attorney's fees and costs in the sum of $\$ 90,310.11$ and interest (at the rate of $5.25 \%$ per annum from $10 / 3 / 14$ until the date the bond is posted).

WHEREAS, NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC and THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON, Respondents, desire to suspend enforcement of the judgment pending determination of the appeal:

NOW, THERETORE, the condition of this obligation is such that, if the above named Respondents, NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC and THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON as Principals, shall prosecute this appeal with effect and shall, if the judgement of the Court be against them, perform such judgement or decree of said court, and pay all such damages, interest and costs as may be awarded against them on such appeal, then this obligation shall be void, otherwise to remain in full force and effect.

PROVIDED, HOWEVER, that in no event shall the surety's liability exceed the penal sum of this bond.

SIGNED this $4^{\text {th }}$ day of November, 2014.

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLD
On behalf of itself and as agent for


## ARGONAUT INSURANCE COMPANY



Surety: Annette M. Leuschner, Nevada Nonresident Licensed Agent and Attorncy-in-fact

I have approved and filed this bond on the

Signature of Court Clerk
day of , 20

Typed name

# Argonaut Insurance Company 

Deliveries Only: 225 W. Washington, 24th Floor
Chicago, IL 60606
United States Postal Service: P.O. Box 469011, San Antonio, TX 78246 POWER OF ATTORNEY of Xlinois and having its principal office in the County of Cook, Illinois does hereby nominate, constitute and appoint:

Cynthia Farrell, Sandra Diad, Evangelina L. Dominick, Vivian Carti, Annete. M. Leuschner, Debra A. Dening Andreafe Gorbert, Anme Potter, Jessica Rannotta, Kelly O'Malley, Edward J, Reilly, Kevin'T, Walsh. Jt.
 and on its behalf as surety, and as its act and deed any and all bonds, contracts, agreements of indemnity and othe maderakings in suretyship provided, however, that the penal sum of any one such instrunent executed hereunder shall not exceed the sum of:
$\$ 40.000 .000 .00$
This Power of Actorney is granted and is signed and sealed under and by the authority of the followidid Re felutiof adopted by the Board of Directors of Argonaut lusurance Company:
"RESOLVED, That the President, Senior Vice President, Vice Prosident, Assistant Vice president ${ }^{4}$ Secretary, Treasurer and each of them hereby is
 officer or attoncy, of the Company, qualifying the attorney or attomeys named in the givectpower of attomey, to execute in behalf of, and acknowledge as the act and deed of the Argonaut Insurance Company, all bond undertakings and ${ }^{8}$ onfracts $\frac{8}{6}$ surctyship, and to affix the corporate seal thereto."

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Argonaut Insurance Company has caused its fiticialscel to be hereunto affixed and these presents to be signed by its duly
authorized officer on the 18th day of July, 2013.

STATE OF TEXAS COUNTY OF HARRIS SS:

On this 18th day of July, 2013 A. Dodefene metary Public of the State of Texas, in and for the County of Harris, duly commissioned and qualified, came THE ABOVE OPFICER of THy CONTPANY, to me personally known to be the individual and officer described in, and who executed the preceding instrument, and he acknowledged thexecution of same, and being by me duly swom, deposed and said that he is the officer of the said Company aforesaid, and that the seal affixed ofthen duly affixed and subser密d to te said instrument by the authority and direction of the said corporation, and that Resolution aḍopted by the Board of Dixectors of saidempanymured to in the preceding instrument is now in force.


 the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy is still in full force and effect and has not been revoked.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand, and affixed the Seal of said Company, on the $\qquad$ day of NOV - 42014


HHE DOCUMENT SS NOT VALID UNLESS PRINTED ON SHADED BACKGROUND WITH BLUE SERLAL NUMBER IN THE UPPER RXGITT HAND CORNER. IF YOU LAVE QUESTIONS ON AUTHENTICTYY OF TXIS DOCUMENT CALL (210) 321 - 8400.

| ASSETS | - |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CASH\& INVESTED CASH | 168,301,489 | UNEARNED PREMIUMS | 136,284,478 |
| BONDS | 032,979,114 | LOSSES | 435,189,164 |
| STOCKS | 380,649,160 | LOSS ADJUSTMENT EXPENSES | 100,360.949 |
| INVESTMENT INCOME DUE AND ACCRUEI | I $5,824,995$ | COMMISSIONS | (4,359,857) |
| PREMIUM BALANCES | 58,821.640 | TAXES, LICENSES AND FEES | 23.065.068 |
| NET DEFERRED TAXASSET | 30,035,891 | OTHER EXPENSES | 4,145,395 |
| REINSURANCE RECOVERABLE | 23,484,148 | FUNDS HELD UNDER REINSURANCE TREATIES | 147,749,656 |
| OTHER ASSETS | 18,792,204 | CURPEENT FEDERAL AND FOREIGN INCOME TAXES | 1,052,000 |
| TOTAL ASSETS | \$1308, 868686 | REMITTANCES AND ITEMS NOT ALLOCATED | 499,024 |
|  |  | AMOUNTS WITHHELDIRETAINED GY COMPANY FOR OTHERS | 13,065,428 |
|  |  | PAYABLE TO PARENT, SUBSIDIARIES \& AFFII,IATES | 1,557,369 |
|  |  | PAYABLE FOR SECURITES | 10,086,099 |
|  |  | POLICYHOLDER DIVIDENDS | 41.827 |
|  |  | PROVISIONS FOR REINSURANCE | 23,216,199 |
|  |  | CEDED REINSURANCE PREMUMS PAYABLE | $5,860.278$ |
|  |  | OTHER ACCRUED EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES | 1,711,416 |
|  |  | TOTAL LIABILITIES | \$ 009,525,693 |
|  |  | COMMON CAPITAL STOCK | 4,500,000 |
|  |  | GROSS PAID IN AND CONTRIBUTED SURPLUS | 183,407,124 |
|  |  | UNASSIGNED SURPLUS | 221,465,631 |
|  |  | TOTAL SURPLUS TO POLICYHOLDERS | \$ 408,382,765 |
|  |  | TOTAL LIABILITIES \& SURPLUS | \$1,308,886,646 |

Janice W. Zwinggi, being duly swom, says that she is VIce Presldent, CFO a Troasurer of Argonaut insurance Company and that to the best of her knowledge and baliof, the foregoing slatement is a thue and correct stalement of the financial condition of said Company as of the 31 st of December, 2013.
Subscribed and swern to before me this...d. day of (1)arch, 2014



Scott J, Kipper, Commissioner of Insurance
Non-Resident Producer
Casualty, Property, Surety
ANNETTE M LEUSCHNER
77 WHALERS CV
BABYLON, NY 11702-2920

## is authorized to transact business as described above

License No: 611036 Issue Date: 08-15-2008 Expiration Date: 09-01-2017

| Nevada Division of Insurance <br> THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT <br> ANNETTE M LEUSCHNER <br> 77 WHALERS CV, BABYLON , NY 11702-2920 <br> LICENSE NUMBER: 611036 | IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO TRANSACT BUSINESS IN ACCORDANCE TO THE LICENSE DESCRIPTION SHOWN BELOW: <br> Non-Resident Producer <br> Casualty, Property, Surety <br> Issue Date: 08-15-2008 <br> Expiration Date: 09-01-2017 <br> Generated by Sircon 08498002 |
| :---: | :---: |

STATE OF NEVADA

## FORECLOSURE MEDIATION PROGRAM MEDIATOR STATEMENT



If needed, a separate sheet may be utilized for additional attendees.
The attending parties are signing this sheet only to memorialize their presence at the mediation. If an agreement is reached, the parties will be requested by the mediator to execute the agreement section of this Mediator Statement, which will outline the basic terms agreed upon at mediation. Neither the mediator nor the mediation administrator may be compelled to testify in any subsequent proceedings regarding the contents of an agreement.

## STATE OF NEVADA FORECLOSURE MEDIATION PROGRAM MEDIATOR STATEMENT



- If no mediation is held: Please ensure the Mediation Summary, Mediation Certification and Mailing Certification (Parts 2, 2A \& 4) are completed.
- If no agreement is reached: please ensure the Attending Parties, Mediation Summary, Mediator Certification and Mailing Cerification (Parts 1, 2, 2A \& 4) are completed.
- If an agreement is reached by the parties: please ensure all applicable parts of this form are attached.


## PART 2: MEDIATION SUMMARY (Please check all that apply)

A Foreclosure Mediation was held on: Octobar 6, 2011
$\square$ A Foreclosure Mediation was not held (Explain):Parties came to an agreement prior to mediation (Explain):

## The Mediator files the following report of the mediation (please check all that apply):

$\square$ The parties resolved this matter. If this box is marked, please complete PART 3: MEDIATION AGREEMENT.
回 The parties participated but were unable to agree to a loan modification or make other arrangements.
$\square$ Lender (Beneficiary or designated representative) failed to attend the mediation.
回 Lender (Beneficiary or designated representative) failed to bring to the mediation each document required.
 (Lender Indicated orginal documents have not been localed after recent transfer to new senvicer-Nationstar). Lender also falled to provide NRS 645.2515 compllant BPO (Inllial BPO was deled "9/30/2006" and second BPO dated 9/2/2011 carried no signalure).
$\square$ Lender (Beneficiary or designated representative) did not have the authority to fully negotiate and modify the loan.
$\square$ Lender (Beneficiary or designated representative) failed to participate in good faith.
Please explain:
$\square$ Homeowner (grantor or person who holds the title of record) failed to attend the mediation.
$\square$ Homeowner (grantor or person who holds the title of record) failed to bring to the mediation each document required. Please specify which document(s) were not provided:
$\square$ Homeowner (grantor or person who holds the title of record) failed to participate in good faith. Please explain:

Other: Homeowner attornay stated this was FMP third mediation with Lender unable to produce proper loan documents aach time.

## PART 2A: MEDIATOR CERTIFICATION

The Mediator hereby certifies, under the penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and accurate of the proceedings as required by NRS Chapter 107.


## STATE OF NEVADA <br> FORECLOSURE MEDIATION PROGRAM <br> MEDIATOR STATEMENT

All documents and discussions presented during the mediation are confidential except in an action for Judicial Review as set forth in the applicable State of Nevada Foreclosure Mediation Rules and NRS Chapter 107.

## PART 3: MEDIATION AGREEMENT (Sections A-G)

THE PARTIES AGREED TO THE FOLLOWING (Please Check all that apply):

## A. RETAIN THE HOME

1. Reinstatement2. Repayment Plan3. Extension4. ARM to Fixed Rate5. Amortization Extended6. Interest Rate Reduction7. Principal Forbearance8. Other Forbearance9. Principal Reduction10. Refinance11. Temporary ModificationExpiration Date : $\qquad$12. Permanent Modification13. Short payoff: \$ $\qquad$
When:
Conditions: $\qquad$14. Gov't. Program: $\qquad$15. Other: $\qquad$

## B. RELINQUISH THE HOME

$\square$ 1. Deed in Lieu of Foreclosure
$\square$ 2. Short Sale3. Voluntary Surrender4. Cash for Keys $\$$ $\qquad$ When: Conditions: $\qquad$5. Gov't. Program: $\qquad$6. Other: $\qquad$

# STATE OF NEVADA <br> FORECLOSURE MEDIATION PROGRAM <br> MEDIATOR STATEMENT 

E. LOAN MODIFICATION (Please complete all that apply)

|  | Temporary Modification | Permanent Modification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Loan Balance | Total loan balance shall be modified to \$ $\qquad$ <br> Effective date $\qquad$ | Total loan balance shall be modified to: \$ $\qquad$ <br> Effective date: $\qquad$ |
| 2. Interest Rate | Period 1 <br> a. Interest rate will be temporarily modified to \% $\qquad$ <br> b. Effective as of $\qquad$ <br> c. For the Period of $\qquad$ months <br> Period 2 <br> a. Interest rate will be temporarily modified to $\qquad$ $\%$ <br> b. Effective as of $\qquad$ months* | Period 1 <br> a. Interest rate will be temporarily modified to $\qquad$ _\% <br> b. Effective as of $\qquad$ <br> c. For the Period of $\qquad$ months <br> Period 2 <br> a. Interest rate will be temporarily modified to $\qquad$ \% <br> b. Effective as of $\qquad$ <br> c. For the Period of $\qquad$ months* |
| 3. Loan Term | There are $\qquad$ monthly payments remaining as of $\qquad$ Begin Date: $\square$ End Date: $\qquad$ | There are $\qquad$ monthly payments remaining as of $\qquad$ Begin Date: $\qquad$ End Date: $\qquad$ |
| 4. Payment | Resulting initial payment: \$ $\qquad$ <br> Principal \& Interest:\$ $\qquad$ <br> Escrow: $\$$ $\qquad$ <br> Total: $\qquad$ | Resulting initial payment: \$ $\qquad$ <br> Principal \& Interest:\$ $\qquad$ <br> Escrow: \$ $\qquad$ <br> Total: $\qquad$ |
| 5. Fees \& Costs | The aforementioned loan balance includes fees \& costs for temporary and permanent modifications as follows: |  |
|  | Incurred | Waived |
|  | Interest \$ $\qquad$ <br> Costs \$ $\qquad$ <br> Fees $\$$ $\qquad$ <br> Other $\$$ $\qquad$ <br> TOTAL: $\$$ | Interest 9 <br> Costs $\$$ $\qquad$ <br> Fees \$ $\qquad$ <br> Other \$ $\qquad$ <br> TOTAL: \$ $\qquad$ |

Other: $\qquad$
Comments: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
"If addilional Periods agreed upon by the parties, please indicate on a separate sheet and attached hereto.

## MEDIATOR STATEMENT

## F. DEFICIENCY \& TAX LIABILTY

Please be advised that the mediator is not permitted to provide any legal or tax advice to the parties on any issues related to the mediation or the terms of any potential settlement agreement. It is suggested that the parties contact a licensed professional of their choice for legal or tax advice related to this mediation and any potential settlement.

1. Deficiency:
$\square$ The settlement agreement will include a provision waiving any deficiency resulting from recovery by the Trustee/Beneficiary of less than the full amount the Trustee/Beneficiary claims now to be due on the loan.Comments:
2. Other deficiency and/or tax liability terms not mentioned above:
$\square$ Additional terms, details are as follows: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
3. Is this agreement contingent upon the signing of other documents and/or forms (i.e. updated financial information; tax returns, divorce decree, etc.)?
$\square$ If yes, please provide a detailed list and/or attach: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

STATE OF NEVADA
FORECLOSURE MEDIATION PROGRAM
MEDIATOR STATEMENT

## G. SIGNATURE OF PARTIES

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the participants in this mediation has executed this mediation agreement on the date set forth. The parties agree to separately prepare and execute the documents necessary to accomplish the terms of this agreement.

| Date | Homeowner (Grantor) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Date | Homeowner (Grantor) |
| Date | Homeowner's Attorney/Representative |
| Date | Lender (Beneficiary) |
| Date | Lender's Attorney/Representative |
| Date | Other (Please specify relationship to Lender or Homeowner) |
| Date | Other (Please specify relationship to Lender or Homeowner) |

STATE OF NEVADA

## FORECLOSURE MEDIATION PROGRAM

MEDIATOR STATEMENT

## PART 4: MAILING CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that I served the foregoing Mediator Statement on the 11 h
2011 by placing true and correct copies thereof in the U.S. mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the following:

| Homeowner (Grantor): |
| :--- |
| $\frac{\text { Catherne Rodriguer }}{\text { CA45 Sweet Pecan Slieel }}$ |

## Homeowner's Attornev/Representative:

Tara D. Newberry

| Connaghan Mewtany |
| :--- |
| 7854 W. Sahara Avenue |
| Las Vegas, NV 89117 |

## Trustee:

## Trustee's Attornev/ Representative:

Qualily Loan Service Corp.
2141 5th Avanue
San Digogo, CA 92101
$\qquad$

## Lender (Beneficiary):

$\qquad$
Lender's Attorney/Representative:
Lindsey Bennot Morales, Esq.
McCarthy and Hollhus
9510 West Sahara Avenue, Sulte 110
Las Vegas, NV 89117

## Other:

$\qquad$
Other:


# 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

## APPELLANTS APPENDIX - VOLUME XIII

Gary E. Schnitzer, Esq., Bar No. 395
Tyler J. Watson, Esq., Bar No. 11735
Kravitz, Schnitzer \& Johnson, Chtd.
8985 S. Eastern Ave., Ste. 200
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Tele: (702) 362-6666
Attorneys for Appellants

Table of Contents (Chronological)

| VOLUME | DOCUMENT | PAGE NUMBER |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| XIII. | Court Transcript from hearing on December <br> 13, 2013 in Department XXV - Continuation <br> from Volume XII. | $2765-2773$ |
| XIII. | Court Transcript from hearing on November 1, <br> 2013 in Department XXV | $2774-2805$ |
| XIII. | Motion for Supplemental Briefing | $2806-2811$ |
| XIII. | Opposition to Motion for Supplemental <br> Briefing | $2812-2817$ |
| XIII. | Order Denying Motion for Supplemental <br> Briefing | $2818-2821$ |
| XIII. | Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and <br> Order | $2822-2835$ |
| XIII. | Motion to Retax Costs and Reduce Excessive <br> Attorney's Fees | $2836-2854$ |
| XII. | Notice of Posting Supersedes Bond <br> Mediator's Statement | $2855-2862$ |
| XIII. | $2863-2870$ |  |

## Table of Contents (Alphabetical)

| VOLUME | DOCUMENT | PAGE NUMBER |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| XIII. | Court Transcript from hearing on November 1, <br> 2013 in Department XXV | $2774-2805$ |
| XIII. | Court Transcript from hearing on December <br> 13, 2013 in Department XXV - Continuation <br> from Volume XII. | $2765-2773$ |
| XIII. | Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and <br> Order | $2822-2854$ |
| XIII. | Mediator's Statement | $2863-2870$ |
| XIII. | Motion for Supplemental Briefing | $2806-2811$ |
| XIII. | Notice of Posting Supersedes Bond <br> Opposition to Motion for Supplemental <br> Briefing | $2863-2870$ |
| XII. | ( |  |


| XIII. | Order Denying Motion for Supplemental <br> Briefing | 2818 -2821 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |

DATED: May 13, 2015


Nevada Bar No. 395
TYLER J. WATSON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 11735
8985 S. Eastern Ave., Ste. 200
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Attorneys for Appellants
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|  | PROCEEDINGS |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |
|  | THE COURT: This is the date and time set for |
| 6 | the evidentiary hearing in the matter of Catherine |
| 7 | Rodriguez versus Nationstar Mortgage. |
| 8 | Let's get the appearances for the record. |
| 9 | MS. NEWBERRY: Tara Newberry on behalf of |
| 10 | Catherine Rodriguez. Your Honor, my client is here she |
| 11 | just stepped out for a minute. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Oh, I do see Ms. Rodriguez. |
| 13 | MR. STERN: Good morning, Your Honor. Ariel |
| 14 | Stern on behalf BNY - I should say "BONY" -- and |
| 15 | Nationstar Mortgage LLC. With me is Allison Schmidt. |
| 16 | And we also have the client, who will be our witness, |
| 17 | Fay Janati. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Thank you so much. |
| 19 | MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Good morning, Your Honor. |
| 20 | Kristin Schuler-Hintz on behalf of BONY. |
| 21 | THE COURT: We had set this evidentiary hearing. |
| 22 | I do want to talk quickly about the fact that the Court |
| 23 | did receive from the parties the stip and order with |
| 24 | regard to the agency of Nationstar as the agent for BONY, |
| 25 | and so obviously that was one of the issucs we had asked |

and so obviously that was one of the issues we had asked
for additional information on. We now have that. Sol am prepared today to see if there is anything further that anybody has to say on that point, and them otherwise to proceed with whatever additional evidence the parties would like to put before the court today.

Ms. Newberry, is there anything to add with regard to the stipulation?

MS. NEWBERRY: Nothing, Your Honor. 1 believe
the agency issues are going to be flushed out in the evidence you hear today.

MR. STERN: We have nothing to add, Your Honor.
We believe we have established that Nationstar is the agent per the beneficiary, the deed of trust, which is an important factor for you to consider.

THE COURT: All right. Well, we will then proceed with - there's really no set way from my perspective to manage these matters. What I typically do is I advise counsel if they have any kind of remarks that they want to make about what evidence they intend to put on and what they believe it will show, or if they just want to wait and do some concluding remarks at the end. Either way is fine.

Well take the testimony and sort of pull it all together. But I have no specific way that I think it needs to be done, or that there's a right or wrong way to
do it. It is just a matter of making sure we have all the pleadings. We've had some discussions about the issues already here and we wanted to get the evidence in the record because of disputes of facts and we needed to do that.

Did you want to make any opening remarks, Ms. Newberry?

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, I would like to reserve time for closing remarks. I will simply state the evidence is going to show you the cost benefit of why the documents were presented in the way they were and why the conduct of the beneficiary through their agent, Nationstar, has transpired to where we are today.

And I believe at the end of our presentation of evidence and our closing remarks we'll argue what that means with regard to sanctions for the bad faith conduct.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Stern.
MR. STERN: Thank you, Your Honor. We would also like to reserve time for a more detailed closing argument. In opening, we would like to preview for the court that we will present evidence that Nationstar Mortgage received, as I think we already briefed in the papers, that the service transfer of this loan very shortly before this mediation took place, the mediation
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at issue. As part of that service transfer, obviously, Nationstar was given the responsibility to appear at mediation and appear in good faith. We will present evidence to show that the document deficiencies that the plaintiffs have complained of were either in the case of being lack of certification, McCarthy \& Holthus as counsel for BONY , had informed plaintiffs and their counsel about this.

This moming, Your Honor, we will show that none of these document deficiencies impacted the mediation in any significant way or really in any manner.

And, finally, as we know, there are questions about various versions of the endorsement on the note. And our witness, Ms. Janati, is going to explain to the Court that Nationstar has policies and procedures in place to address verification that those policies and procedures are important to avoid issues such as the one the plaintiff is trying to make here. We will show why these various eadorsements were presented.

And in conclusion, Your Honor, explain that there was absolutely no wrongdoing on the part of Nationstar. To the contrary. The evidence will show that Nationstar was the right party at the mediation and it mediated in good faith with all of the documents that were necessary. While not presented, certainly,
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ballpark between 15,000 and 20.
    Q So you financed the rest?
    A Yes,Idid.
    Q How did you get financing?
    A Through the lender that the track was going
through.
    Q Who was the builder?
    A The builder was - I don't know who the builder
was. Arbor Glen is the name of - but I do not remember
who the builder was.
    Q So you went to purchase the home. Was it a new
home?
    A Yes.
    And the fmance that you received, do you
remember the company that loaned you the money?
    A Well, I don't remember because there was two
different entities. I did paperwork in the sale's office
and then they sent you to their entity, and then that is
when they were discussing this new way of doing a loan.
I was just old-school. My ex-husband and I did a 30-year
to begin with and then we refinanced our home inton :15
ycar and that's all l was accustom to.
    Q So what's this new loan that you were presented
with?
    A They were saying that it is interest free and
```
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    you could be in your home 30 years, 40 years. Why not
take advantage of it. It's the new way. They are going
out with the old and in with the new. And I was foolish
to look Into the FHA way.
Q When did this happen, what year?
A Around 2003-cnd of 2003, 2004.
Q When did you actually purchase the home?
A 2005.
Q After you purchased the home, you started making
payments on it?
A Yes.
Q Who did you make the payments to?
A Right in the beginning it was Country Wide and
then it switched to First Horizon. I want to say it was
six months or maybe a year after. It wasn't that much
longer.
Q First Horizon?
A To First Horizom.
Q How long did you make payments to First Horizon?
A I want to say until 2008 or 2009. Somewhere
around there.
Q How much did you pay for the house?
A 269.
Q Do you know how much you financed when you
purchased the home?

```
A 269.
    Q So the I5 to $25,000 that you put down, what did
that go towards?
    A Put it towards upgrades and I had a pool put in.
So that was all part of it.
    Q When you purchased the home, could you afford
it?
    A Yes.
    Q Did something change for you financially after
you purchased the house?
    A Several things. My work situation changed. I
was doing private clients and I worked on primarily
construction workers, and when the market started falling
and they were losing their jols, well, I am the first
thing that's going to go.
    Q You said you worked on them. Are you talking
about massage therapy?
    A Yes. And then sales at Circuit City. I worked
there from '03 to '07, I believe is when they closed
their doors. And then I had my twin move in with me
becanse their business started going down.
    Q So your income decreased because of your
constructionmworker clients no longer using massage
services and Circuit City closed and you lost your job?
```

    A Yes.
    Q Did you stop making your mortgage payment when
that happened?
A No.
Q What did you do?
A I had my sister and their family move in so we
could help each other.
Q And did that make it possible for you to keep
making the mortgage payment?
A Yes.
Q That was 2007?
A Around 2007-maybe the end of 2007, leginning
of ' 08.
Q Then what happened financially for you in 2008?
A Again, the business was not coming in and I
tried seeking other employment and sales because 1 had a
sales background and other massage places. And the
massage was not going anywhere, and you barcly make it.
And there was no sales jobs.
Q So what did you do with the reduction in income?
A What did I do - what?
Q What did you do with this reduction in income in
2008?
A I contacted First Horizom and I begged them to
help me because I was going down fast. And they turned
around and said because 1 worked at FX You Salon 1 had my
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private clientele, and so the FX You Salon is - I'm a
subcontractor, so when someone walked into that salon,
they would call me and I would go there. So it wasn't
like a permanent thing. You never knew when you were
going to get a client. Sol would submit to them the
paycheck stubs of getting paid to them and they said that
that was nothing m First Horizon suid that it was not
the way they looked at things. And I said, Well, if it's
messing it up it's not that much. It's only $40, $60, so
let's just take it off so I can get belp. They turned
around and said it was on the underwriter's desk and she
would have to contact me
    Were you still current on your mortgage payment
when you communicated with First Horizon about your
reduction of income?
    A Yes.
    Q Did you have any other debts besides your
mortgage in 2008?
    A I claimed bankruptcy in 2008.
    Q Why?
    A I was trying to eliminate debt that I had to try
to continue making my mortgage and stuff.
    Q What debts did you have that made you file
bankruptcy?
    A My student loans, which I thought you could
```
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    claim and you can't claim them.
Q So you filed bankruptey to discharge your
student loan and then after filing found out that you
were still going to have to pay them?
A Yes.
Q How much were your student loans?
A They are around $12,13,00 \mathrm{~N}$.
Q Do you have any credit card debt?
A I had very little credit card debt. I don't
remember the exact amount, but it was extremely low.
Q More than a thousand, less than a thousand?
A I think it was more than thousand.
Q More than 2,000?
A It was probably altogether - I don't know - 1
would be guessing. Idon't know how much it was.
Q So you filed bankruptcy in 2008. Did you stop
making your mortgage payment then?
A No.
Q Why not?
A Because I wanted to keep my home.
Q Do you remember when your bankruptey case was
discharged?
A Around 2010, somewhere around there.
Q After you filed your bankruptcy case, how long
did you continue to make your mortgage payment?

```
A I don't know the exact month. But I continued because I was in constant contact with -- not because they were calling me, I was calling them. First Horizon never contacted me. They turaed around and instructed me to stop making my payment, and that's the reason the file was sitting on the underwriter's desk and not getting looked at.
Q When did that happen?
A Probably the end of 2008,9 .
Q End of 2009?
A Somewhere around there.
Q So you were trying to get your mortgage payment; the monthly payment, changed with First Horizon. You had submitted documents to them and it was sitting on the underwriter's desk?
A That is what they kept telling me.
Q And then eventually someone told you to stop making the mortgage payment.
A The reason they weren't looking at me is because I was current. And the only way that they would look at me and do a loan mod is ifI was late. And 1 said, 1 don't feel comfortable doing that. 1 am a good debtor, why can't I get a loan mod. And they said it's because that's not how it works. You have to be late.
Q How did that make you feel?
```

A Extremely uncomfortable.
Q Why?
A I have never done that. I believe in paying my
bills. That is not me.
Q So after they told you to stop making your mortgage payment, did you?

A Not the first montl. The second month I did.
Q Why?
A Because $I$ wanted to get help and it was getting closer to when my sister was moving out and that money was going to be gone and I didn't have any other income to count on. I didn't have any family members. Nothing.

Q Do you remember how much money you were making in 2009 ?

A Roughly around 37 a year.
Q 37,000 a year?
A Yes.
Q How much per month did that average for you?
A I would say around 25 to 3,000 .
Q 2,500 to 3,000 a month?
A Yes.
Q So after you missed your mortgage payment, at some point in 2009 what happened?

A I contacted the bank again and I said, Okay, I missed a payment. And they said it takes more than one

```
payment. And thea Ilet it go for, I want to say six
months. And then I just started geting scared that I
wasn't going to get ont of this circle that I was forced
into, so I sent a payment and they sent it back to me
saying that now I was in default and they could not
accept payment. Then I sent another payment in saying I
wanted to show good faith. I am tired of waiting. How
do I hurry this up. I have doae what they've asked me.
I sent in every document, everything, vvery letter.
Whatever they asked of me, I sent it.
    Q So after you missed a payment you continued to
subrnit loan modification requests and documents and
paperwork and communicate with First Horizon?
    A Yes.
    Q And then after it took too long, in your
opinion, you started to make payments to them while you
were still waiting to hear back on the loan mod?
    A Yes.
    Q And they refused the payment?
    A Yes. I tried to make two different payments.
    Q What happened after they refused your payments?
    A Then I got scared and nervous again and l'm like
I am going to lose my home because they are not working
with me. I don't understand. I was good up to date and
they would not work with me, and then I get behind and
    20
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now they say I'm in default and can't work with me.
Q So then what happened?
A I got a letter on my door saying they were going
to foreclose on me. And I went to a wine party that my
girlfriend was having and I was talking to my girlfriend
and telling her how frustrated I was and how come
everybody else seems to be getting these loan mods and it
doesn't take any time to get them. And an attorney was
present there overheard me and came up and introduced
herself and explained what was going on because she was
familiar with it.
And so then I told her that I didn't have any
money to pay for counsel and she turned around and took
me on pro bono.
Q And what happened with the foreclosure that was
filed?
A I elected for mediation and then I went to
mediation.
Q And when you elected mediation, who did you
think you were supposed to be communicating with about
your loan?
A First Horizon.
Q Who showed up at mediation?
A Met Life.
Q Do you remember when that happened?

A Around July 2010.
Q Who was present at that mediation?
A For the bank it was this African American attorney. She broughta partner that was Hispanic. She was showing her how it worked. The mediator, Sarah, my attorney, my mother and myself.

Q What happened during that mediation?
A She had come in and introduced herself and theu she turned around and was looking at my financials that you have to disclose, and she told me that 1 lived over my means.

Q Did she explain that to you?
A Ihad a Starbucks coffee and that was excessive baving Starbucks coffee. And because I owned a car and I should use pubtic transportation, but in my area they did not have public transportation. My grocery bill, I believe I put like $\$ 400$ down a month, but that was me and my two grand-boys that I helped with. I had them four days a week back then.
Q. Your grandchildren were with you four days a week?

A Yes.
Q What else happened during the mediation?
A The gentleman on the phone turued around and had given some numbers out and it ended up being more than
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what I paid in my current mortgage and then she fold me to try to go and eliminate things that were unnecessary and to get my food costs down.

Q Do you remember how much money you were actually bringing home, not your gross, but your net at that point in time?

A Around 21, 22, I think.
Q Do you remember the mortgage payment approximately that they were offering you at that mediation to pay?

A It was 15 something.
Q Do you remember the name of the person who was on the phone at the mediation?

A No.
Q Do you know who he said he worked for?
A He said he worked for - I'm not sure. Idon't remember him saying who he worked for.

Q I know it was a few years ago.
A The first one I don't remember.
Q Do you know whether he worked for First Horizon or not?

A No. He didn't say he worked for First Horizon. First Horizon was never mentioned. I was the only one that mentioned First Horizon.

Q What happened at the end of the mediation?

```
    A We didn't accept the offer because it was higher
than what my current mortgage was, and I was asking to
get it reduced and they upped it on me and it wasn'f a
fixed. It was a trial or something like that. And then
they would reevaluate it or some kind of thing like that.
    Q So what happened after the mediation in 2010?
    A After that I did what she had suggested; I got a
different car. I stopped drinking Starbucks and I
couldn't lower my food bill. And then got served with or
it came in the mail, a PJR, Judge Mosley. It was from
Judge Moslcy.
    Q So you went in front of Judge Mosley?
    A Yes.
    Q Do you know what that was about?
    A She was claiming, the attorney was claiming that
I was not - how did she put it.
    Q You said she, who are you referring to?
    A The attorney from the other side. The one that
was in mediation. She showed up at Judge Mosley's. She
was trying to get a foreclosure.
    Q So you understood you went in front of Judge
Mosley because she requested it so she could foreclose on
the house?
    A Yes.
    Q What happened at that hearing?
```

A She tried to say that she did give something
fair and doable. And then Judge Mosley asked her to lay
out the guidelines that she had laid out in mediation.
He stated that that is not fair. You are not in good
faith. Go back to the drawing board. Go back to your
client and tell them this is not in good faith when you
are going higher. It is showing not good faith.

Q So what happened after the hearing in front of Judge Mosley?

A I thought we were going to hear from the attorney and we didn't. I got another card in the mail to elect for mediation, so I elected for mediation. And then Iwent to mediation again. The mediator at that time was Carlos. And representing from the bank was Chris and another intern that was learning. A young lady.

And so we met in the waiting area and he goes, Ms. Rodriguez, today is going to be a good day. We are all going to have a great Christmas. You are going to walk out with a loan mod. And I was like, awesome. That would be great news. We can all get our lives back in order. And he turned around and goes, Yeah, it is a done deal. It's easy. So you can start celebrating Christmas. So it was like, thank God. Finally.

And we go into the mediation. He gets the
person on the phone, and then he gets on his phone and steps outside. And he walks in and he just looked like the life had just been taken out of him. And he just kept saying, I'm sorry. I really thought we could walk out with a loan mod todsy.

Q Who was the person on the phone at the second mediation?

A The guy said he was Nationstar. I don't remember his name.

Q The mediation where the attomey, Chris, appeared for the bank, do you remember when that happened?

A Yes, in December.
Q Of what year?
A 2010.
Q And at that time who was servicing your loan?
A Nationstar.
Q And after that mediation did you get a loan modification?

A No.
Q What happened next?
A After that mediation because nothing came of it I weut to another mediation and that was my third mediation. It was on the other side of town by the airport and Ms. Lindsey - Hi - came in. Well, first,
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it was Steve and I, the mediator. He came from Arizona. And we were sitting there talking. We were waiting for my attorney and their attorney from the bank. And 1 had told him that traffic is bad and they are probably stuck in it, so we were just talking before they got there.

Q When was that third mediation?
A 2011, Ibelieve.
Q Do you know what month?
A I am drawing a blank on the month.
Q You said hi to somcone in the courtroom today. Who were you saying hi to?

A Lindsey.
Q Can you describe what she is wearing?
A She has a white shirt on, brown jacket - black jacket with a glasses and reddish blonde hair.

Q How do you recognize her?
A She was the attorney from the bank.
Q And once--
A All the attorneys from the other side were extremety nice but the first one.
Q. And when the third mediation took place in 2011, take us through how the mediation started and what happened.

A Lindsey came and introduced herself. And we all signed the paper. And she handed me a stack of papers. 27

```
It was copies of my loam. And she turned around and said
this is what they gave me. It's not a complete file, so
we can't really proceed.
    MS. NEWBERRY: I am going to approach the
witness with what has been previously marked as
Exhibit }10\mathrm{ to the Petition, Your Honor. Counsel, would
you like to review the original before I present it to
the witness?
    MR. STERN: Sure.
    MS. NEWBERRY: May I approach the witness, Your
Honor?
    THE COURT: You may.
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q Take a moment and look through that document.
Do you recognize it?
    A Yes.
    Q How do you recognize it?
    A This is a copy of my loan. And Lindsey handed
me this. My attomey had pointed out. I had seen it too
but it is stamped on this side right here (indicating)
Nationstar Mortgage, and none of my other documents had
that. I received this through the mail or on my
doorstep.
    Q Prior to that mediation?
    A Prior to that mediation.
Q And how do you know that's the document Lindsey
handed you at the mediation?
    A It is the only one like it. If you line
everything up, it lines up.
    MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, I would like to offer
this original document into evidence. It has previously
been introduced.
    THE COURT: You want to put in the original,
Counsel?
    MS. NEWBERRY: If he will stipulate to a copy,
that is sufficient for us.
                            THE COURT: Typically, the Court would not take
the original, but would compare the original to the copy,
unless there is some objection to the copy.
            MR. STERN: We have no objection to the copy,
Your Honor. This original itself is a copy. So we are
fine going forward. We have the original here.
            THE COURT: I understand. Let me just see what
the witness is seeing. We have an Exhibit 10 here. And
there is no dispute is there, that this is a true and
correct copy?
            MS. NEWBERRY:That is the copy that we received
at the mediation, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: Is there any objection to the
admission of this document?
```

MR STERN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. And, again, this is

## Plaintiff's proposed -

MS. NEWBERRY: Petition for Judicial Review Exhibit 10.

THE COURT: Just wanted to make surc that is admitted. I will hand this back to the witness.

MS. NEWBERRY: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. STERN: So for our purposes, Your Honor, is this Exhibit 10, or are we working -

THE COURT: Well, again, until I know exactly how you all have put the proffered ones, I am not quite sure how I want to mark them. Like you said, you have PJR exhibits, and then you have a different reference. We could actually do it a different way entirely, although, think it would be too complicated with the number of exhibits that you have, which is just as they come into evidence mark them 1,2 , and so on. But I'm really not comfortable doing that because you have so many.

MR, STERN: I would suggest that we go with the exhibit numbers that are already with them, if that works for Ms, Newberry.

THE COURT: Okay. But we don't have duplicate numbers in terms of different sets in what we're calling
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them?
MS. NEWBERRY: No. No. The Petition for Judicial Review exhibits are 1 through 16, and judicial notice Exhibits are 1 through 32.

THE COURT: But that's what I'm saying. So the numbers overlap, just different titles on them. So that's the only tricky part, but if we call it Petition for Judicial Review, Exhibit 10, I guess we can make that work.

Do you have your own set? I'm assuming you do.
MR. S'TERN: We have a few documents that have not been marked. And what I was thinking we could do is give them numbers like 200 and 201 so we could keep them pretty far apatt.

THE COURT: Has anything been marked here with my clerk?

MR. STERN: No.
THE COURT: Okay, Let's just bring out Petition for Judicial Review 10.

MR. STERN: Okay.
MS. NEWBERRY: Thank you, Your Honor.

## BY MS. NEWBERRY:

Q. Looking at the note that you just described to the Court and the stamp of Nationstar, what was your understanding of who owned your note at the mediation?
but he didn't have what we were looking at.

Q Do you remember anything else that was said during the mediation between the mediator and the gentleman on the phone from Nationstar?

A No.
Q Did Lindsey say anything during the mediation that you remember?

A She apologized for everybody's time and said this is what they gave me. It's not a complete document, complete package.

Q Were there any other documents beside that Exhibit 10 , the note that you are looking at right now?
Were there any other documents that were in the pile that were handed to you?

A From Lindsey, no. I was onty handed this and the sign-in sheet.

Q What did you want to happen at mediation?
A Again, I was hoping for that loan modification.
Q So at the end of this mediation in October of 2011 , did you get a loan modification?

A No.
Q Did they offer you anything that was affordable for you?

A I don't think they offered anything. I think

```
that my attorney made the statement that the offering of
where it was affordable was broke down.
Q So you made an offer to Nationstar for an affordable payment?
A Yes.
Q Do you remember approximately what that was?
A My payment would have been like a thousand dollars. But it was broke down one or two percent over so many years and then it was like a 40 -year loan. And then he furned around and said, No, we can't do that. We have guidelines and we have to stay within those guidelines.
Q. Did he explain what the guidelines were?
A He did but they weren't, they couldn't work with me. They were still bringing that payment up past what the - and the interest rate was up.
Q So at the end of the mediation what happened next?
A Oh, in the mediation my attorney asked the gentleman on the phone if they were owners of the note and he said, Yes. And she goes, Are you the servicer and the person that owns the note? And he stated, Yes. And then she asked, So if you are the owner of the note, you're telling me that you don't have the authority to lower the interest rate and the payment, so it's
```

affordable for Ms. Rodriguez. He stated, No. He couldn't do that.
Q So after mediation ended what was your understanding of what would happen with your home?

A I didn't know what was going on. Every time I went into a mediation I was all - but Chris, he turned around and said I would have a modification. I was lost. Don't know. Didn't know what to expect.

Q So what did you do after the mediation in October of 2011?

A I got a thing taped to my door and I was driving, and I go in through the garage. I never use my front door. But the porch light had shimmered off the tape and that's what caught my eye. And just one single piece of paper was on my door. And I was like, that's odd. So I went in and got it and it said that they were going to foreclose on me. How come they won't work with me. Why won't they give me a loan mod. Why won't they let me stay in my home.

Q You said this document was taped to your door. Was it the same as any of the prior documents you had received from the bank with regard to foreclosure?

A No. This one was different. Most of the things that are taped to the door are copies of the loan. This one was saying it was foreclosing on me.

| 1 | Q What did you understand that document to be? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A The one that was taped to my door? |
| 3 | Q Yes. |
| 4 | A That they were going to take my house. |
| 5 | Q What did you do with that information? |
| 6 | A I contacted my attorney that evening and she |
| 7 | asked me to bring the document into her office. And she |
| 8 | asked was there any other papers attached to that |
| 9 | document. And I said, No, it's just this single one. |
| 10 | And she goes, That's odd. And she goes, They didn't hand |
| 11 | deliver it. They taped it to your door? And I said, |
| 12 | Yeah, they taped it to my door. |
| 13 | Q Did you bring that document to court today? |
| 14 | A Yes, I did. |
| 15 | Q Is this your stack in the envelope. |
| 18 | A Yes. |
| 17 | Q That's the document? |
| 18 | A Yes. |
| 19 | MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, if I may approach the |
| 20 | bench. |
| 21 | ThE COURT: You may. |
| 22 | Is there a copy of this? |
| 23 | MS. NEWBERRY: There is a copy of this in the |
| 24 | Petition for Judicial Review, Your Honor. |
| 25 | THE COURT: Okay. |
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that time frame of the last mediation and this was taped
to the door. And up until then Melon was never
mentioned. To this day I still get information from
Nationstar stating that I owe them money and they are the
halder of the note.
    Q So you got this lawsuit after mediation where
Nationstar said they owned it. And now Bank of New York
Melon say they owned it. Who were you supposed to pay
your mortgage to?
    A I have no clue.
    Q What happened with the judicial foreclosure
case?
A I went and spoke to my attorney and that was going to cost quite a bit of money and I didn't have it so I went to family members seeing if I could borrow it, and no one had extra cash to come up with to proceed this law case. My attorney contacted the attorney one more time on that.
Q Your attorney talked to the attomey for who?
A For the bank, New York Melon.
Q Okay.
A And she stated that she said that they will not give me a loan mod so I might as well short sell my house and just be done with it. They will never work with me.
Q Did you want to short sale your house?
```
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A I did not want to lose my house. It's my home. It's my kids' home. My grand-kids, the grew up there. It has been devastating on everybody involved.

Q Since 2009 , when you were told to default on the mortgage, did you spend any money on the house itself?

A Yes. I keep it up, I do landscaping. My drip system, air conditioning, pull pump, water heater, garage, the door like a yearly thing. I think it has a contract on it hecause it always goes out at the same time. Just painting and keeping it up.

Q If youre in foreclosure, why would you do that?
A Because it's my home.
Q Are you in an HOA?
A Yes.
Q Are you current on your HOA payment?
A Yes, 1 am.
Q Going back to the judicial foreclosure, so after you were told short sale was your only resolution, what happened next?

A So I went to the U-Haul place and got some boxes and started packing my house and my grand-kids were crying, asking, Grandma why are they taking our home? And I said, 1 don't know, but the attorney sald there is nothing more we can do. We fought a goed fight. For some reason the house must be gold or something because 39
everybody else is getting loan mods and I'm not asking any different than anybody else. I have always been a good debtor. I'm sorry. I don't get emotional unless I talk about my kids. They were so hurt and distranght and so I stopped packing to comiort them.

And about two days later I got a phone call from my attorney and she said I just talked to a young lady, her name is Venicia down at Legal Aid, and they might by able to help you. Go down there and see.

So I went down there the day after our conversation 1 went straight over there. And they turned around and I met with her and I met with her associate and I had brought all my documents because I carry them in my car it was like part of life at this point. And they turned around and said, Well, I don't understand why they are not giving you a loan mod.

And I said, I can't understand it either. It bogs my mind how $\rightarrow$ and I am watching my colleagues all get loan mods. They started in three months and they are done. I'm years on this rocky -it's not a good place to be where I stm. There is no stability. And then to get this and basically told that there is nothing you can do. They turned around and said that they would review my case. They had to take it up to their partners and that they were having one at the end of that week

40

Q You said "they" are you taking about Venicia?
A Legal Aid.
Q Legal Aid Center. Okay.
A And so then Legal Aid contacted me and said that they were going to take my case, that it had enough merit in there to pursue it. And so -

Q After the judicial foreclosure case, you obtained counsel to represent you. What is the next thing that you were involved in with regards to the case?

A Just giving documentation, handing whatever I could over. But basically my attorney had everything and we went in front of Judge Bonaventure $-I$ think that is how you pronounce his name.

Q Why did you go in front of Judge Bonaventure?
A I guess to look at the case. And he turned around he looked at the documents that both sides had handed and told us to go. I forget how he said it, bat it is to continue on, or - I don't know how you put it.

Q What was your understanding of why you were in court in front of Judge Bonaventure?

A I thought he was going to overrule all the things and make the bank come to a modification.

Q And after that hearing, what happened?
A After that hearing we came here.
Q What is your understanding of why a Petition for

```
Judicial Review that we are here today for was filed?
A It's saying something about a timely thing. I'm not sure what it is.
Q Why did you want to come before Judge Delaney today?
A I wanted to appear to beg to have some modification done like everybody else, 1 am not asking any different. I am not trying to elude anybody or deceive anybody, that has mever been my intention. So I am just asking the court to make them, if they can, come to some undification so I can keep my home where my kids know.
MS. NEWBERRY: I have nothing further, Your Honor. Pass the witness.
THE COURT: Mr. Stem.
```


## CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BYMR. STERN:

```
Q Good moming Ms. Rodriguez.
A Good morning.
Q My name is Ariel Stern. I represent Nationstar Mortgage, as well BONY Melon. Ms. Schuler-Hintz also represents BONY Melon. I have a few questions for you I promise I will be shorter, and by shorter, I mean duration of time than your attorney was with you. So
```


## this will not take too long, but I do have some

questions, okay?
A Okay.
Q In your testimony you mentioned that you have been dealing with First Horizon; do you recall that?

A Yes.
Q You said that First Horizon instructed you to stop making payments?

A Yes, they did.
Q Are we correct in understanding that Nationstar never instructed you to stop making payments?

A No. They did not tell me that.
Q What about BNY, BONY, did BONY ever instruct you to stop making payments?

A I den't know whe BONY is.
Q BNYMelon.
A Oh, they never.
Q Okay. What about the first Petition for
Judicial Review when you were before Judge Mosley, did
you have an opportunity to defend yourself in that case?
A My attorney spoke for me.
Q So you had an attorney?
A Yes.
Q You said in your testimony that you believe in
paying your bills and it is something you have done all
your life; do you recall that?
A Yes.
Q I have a couple follow-up questions, and I
apologize in advance, but it is important for us to get
all of this information out.
A No, that's fine.
Q As per your testimony, you stopped paying on
your mortgage in 2009, correct?
A Correct.
Q And since- -1 believe you said in your
testimony that you said you started paying again at some
point?
A I tried paying.
Q When was the last time you tried to make a
payment?
A The latter part of, I would say 2009, 2010. In
that area.
Q So since that part of 2009 and 2010, all the way
up today in November of 2013 , have you made any payments
on this mortgage?
A No.
Q During that time period you mentioned you are
current on your HOA. Just so that we're clear, are you
paying your HOA?
A Yes. 44

Q The bank is not paying that?
A No.
Q What about insurance and escrow payments?
A No.
Q The bank is making those payments?
A The bank is making those. To my knowledge they are. I don't know who really is.

Q But as far as you know -
A I just know l'm not making them.
Q I think that is enough.
If we understand your testimony correctly, you would like to be paying about $1,000 \mathrm{a}$ month; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Your mortgage terms before you started the process with First Horizon was about $\$ 1,500 \mathrm{a}$ month; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q So since you are not making those payments now can you tell us how you are using those funds that you are not paying for this mortgage, whether it's the 1,500 or the $\$ 1,000$ ?

A What Iam doing with it?
Q Yes.
A I was living on it. I had two grandsons that I
was helping raise. My son took a loss in his job and we all tried to stick together on these hard times.

So as I understand it, the money that you are not paying for the mortgage you are using for your family and for living expenses, that sort of thing?

A In that time frame. But in the last, I want to say probably siace April, I have been putting $\$ 600$ in an escrow account, or not an escrow account - I don't know what it is called. An account I set up with my attorney,

Q Are you talking about your attorney's trust account?

A That's it.
Q Now, we all understand that you want to keep this home?

A Yes.
Q If you aren't able to afford the home, do you believe you should nevertheless keep it?

A If can't?
MS. NEWBERRY: Objection. Argumentive. THE COURT: Overruled.

## BYMR. STERN:

Q If you can't afford the home, do you believe you should nevertheless be allowed to keep it?

A 1 do not think I am understanding your question. If I got a loan mod then I could afford it because it
would be in -
Q I understand that.
A I am confused.
Q Let me remove the confusion. What I am asking is for you to make an assumption. Assume that you cannot afford the home. That assumption carries with it that you weren't able to get a loan modification; do you understand that?

A Okay.
MS. NEWBERRY: Objection, Your Honor. It's an incomplete hypothetical and assumes facts not in evidence.

THE COURT: Overruled.
MR. STERN: Thank you.

## BY MR. STERN:

Q So you understand the hypothetical. If you are not able to afford the loan and you have not been able to get a loan modification, if you assume that, do you believe you should be able to keep the home anyway?

A Should I be able to keep the home anyway without paying; is that what you're asking?

Q I am asking if you can't afford the home because of your financial circumstances and you were unable to get a loan modification.

A I guess I would have to move out because that
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would be -
    MR. STERN: Okay. Ms. Rodriguez, I do not have
    any more questions for you.
        MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: I just have a couple quick
questions.
BY MS. SCHULER-HINTZ:
    Q You stated you were paying bills on the
property. Have you paid your water bill?
    A Yes.
    Q Was there a lien on the property placed by the
Water District for an unpaid bill?
    A Idon't believe -- no. My water is current.
    Q Do you know if there was a lien for unpaid water
dues?
    A Not to my knowledge. There shouldn't be no lien
on the home.
    Q How about for the sewer; are you paying the
sewer regularly?
    A Sewer is with trash. No.
    Q You're not paying those?
    A No.
    Q So those are some of the bills you're not
paying?
    A Those are the two. But everything else is two
and three months ahead, that's why water, I should not
    4 8
have no lien on me.
    You stated that you were unaware that Bank of
New York Melon had an interest in the property until you
received the complaint for judicial foreclosure; is that
correct?
    A Correct.
    Q Did you participate in a Petition for Judicial
Review after the first mediation? Is that correct?
    A The PJR?
    Q Yes.
    A Yes.
    Q Did you sign a declaration in comection with
that Petition for Judicial Review?
    A l'm not sure.
    Q You did.
    A Okay.
        MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: May I approach?
        MS. NEWBERRY: May I see it.
        THE COURT: You are going to try to refresh her
recollection first?
    MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Yes.
    THE COURT: Okay.
    MS. SCHULER-HINTZ:Go ahead and take a look at
that.
        MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, if I may review this
```

document?
THE COURT: I'm sorry?
MS. NEWBERRY: Have you reviewed that document?
THE COURT: I have not seen this document, no.
MS. NEWBERRY: It's dated May 16th of 2013.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: I'm sorry. That must be the
wrong -
THE COURT: We were assuming you were using that
to refresh your recollection, but if that is not the
document that Ms. Schuler-Hintz was inquiring about,
then, obviously that's not the correct document.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: I'm sorry, Your Honor. It
is the wrong one. My apologizes. I thought it was
attached to a different one.
THE COURT: You can come and take this back.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: My apologies on that one.
BY MS. SCHULER-HNNTZ:
Q At the first mediation did your attomey receive
a document, or did you receive documents at the
mediation?
A (No andible response.)
Q A copy of the deed of trust, copy of the
assignment?
A I don't remember. I remember signing in. The
only reason I remember this is because it was thicker.
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Most of the things that I had in front of me was onty a
thin paper.
    THE COURT: Ms. Schuler-Hintz, if you want to
cut to the chase, if you know there is information out
there that indicates that this witness would have been
aware of. I have no problem if you just say what it is
and ask her.
    MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: I will cut to the chase,
Your Honor.
BY MS. SCHULER-HINTZ:

Q Ms. Redriguez, there were two prior mediations.
At one of those mediations an assigument was produced to
Bank of New York Melon. It was in fact produced at the
last mediation which was attended by Ms. Bennett-Morales.
It was produced by Ms. Beneetr-Morales at the prior
mediation and it was produced to your attorney prior to
the mediation.
    So out of the last mediation you had a recorded
assignment to Bank of New York Melon, and in fact, it was
a certified copy from the County Recorder; do you recall
receiving that?
    A No, I don't recall.
    Q Do you recall receiving a certified copy of the
deed of trust from the County Recorder at that mediation?
    A The mediation with Lindsey?
```

    Q Yes.
    A This is what I received at the mediation with
    Lindsey (indicating). That's all I received.
THE COURT: And just to be clear for the record,
what is "this."
THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. The loan -
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: A copy of the note'?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MS.SCHULER-HINTZ:
Q It is your contention that Ms. Bennett-Morales
did not produce the certified copy of the - the
certified certified copy of the deed of trust or the
certified certified assignment at that mediation?
A She only handed me this (indicating). I don't
know if she handed my attomey that, but I know that what
was handed to me, the note was the only thing that was
handed to me.
MS. SCHULER-HINTZ:Thank you.
THE COURT: Anything further?
MS. SCHULER-HNTTZ: No. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Ms. Newberry.
MS. NEWBERRY: Just to clarify that last
exchange.
III
III
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\section*{REDIRECT EXAMINATION}
BY MS. NEWBERRY:
    Q Your recollection at the mediation when you were
handed the note that you testified today was given to you
by Lindsey from Bank of New York Melon/Nationstar, the
note that they are representing, that's the only document
that you recall receiving?
    A Yes.
    Q And you indicated that with your current
judicial foreclosure case you have been paying \(\$ 600\) a
month to your attorney's trust account. What was the
purpose of those funds?
    A It was for any depositions, travel, getting me
used to paying payments again for a house, like if I had
a house now.
    Q. So it is your understanding that the litigation
for the judicial foreclosure there were going to be costs
involved with that and you were responsible for paying
those costs?
    A Yes.
    MS. NEWBERRY: Okay. Nothing further, Your
Honor.
    THE COURT: Anything further?
    MR. STERN: I have one quick follow-up question,
Your Honor.

\section*{RECROSS-EXAMINATION}
BYMR. STERN:
    Q So if I understand it, the \(\$ 600\), the purpose is,
as you testified, litigation costs, as well as, in your
words, getting used to paying for a home again?
    A Yes.
    Q Are you able to pay more than \(\$ 600\) for both of
those purposes per month?
    A Icould, yes.
    Q How much could you pay?
    A I could probably pay another 400.
    Q But you are not doing that?
    A No.
        MR. STERN: That's all I have, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: Are we complete, Ms. Newberry?
        MS. NEWBERRY: Yes.
        THE COURT: Ms. Rodriguez you may step down.
Thank you.

We will take a five-minute break, and then I am going to ask counsel to come into chambers so I can talk to you about scheduling matters. But a five-minute break for now.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: So we are back on the record. Based on the discussion that we had in chambers in terms of the
scheduling conflict, it was inadvertent, and again, my apologies for the scheduling conflict that we have with my bench trial returning this afternoon. We are going to go ahead and take a witmess out of order to accommodate an out of state travel schedule, and then we will look at reschcduling the remainder of the proceedings.

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, ifI may. I just wanted to address the request for judicial notice that we filed, as well as the exhibit attached to the Petition for Judicial Review prior to this witness testifying in order to determine what has been admitted with regard to exhibits to the court.

THE COURT: Oh, actually that was something that I was discussing with my staff at the break because my clerk is also trying to figure out how to handle it. What we can see has been submitted technically in Odyssey, and there may have to be an adjustment to that, is basically everything that is being proffered as exhibits as what we identified earlier as the PIR exhibits, as well as the judicial notice exhibits.

Obviously, if there is no objection from counsel, as to the judicial notice exhibits, for instance, we call consider those admitted and we can proceed. I am assuming if you haven't had a chance before today to come up with any other stipulation as to
the PJR exhibits then we may still have to go through some formalities.

But, again, if there is no objection to those and having everything before the court, you know, obviously that makes things a lot more efficient, a lot quicker and a lot easier, but it's not required.

Mr. Stern or Ms. Schuler-Hintz, where do you all stand?

MR. STERN: Your Honor, we do not object to the request for judicial notice because they are public documents. With respect to the other exhibits, maybe overall exhibit handling since we are going to have a continuance obviously before we reconvene perbaps the attorneys need to meet and confer and just mark the exhibits sequentially so that we don't have any confusion.

THE COURT: If something like that is inadvertently but happily presented by the fact that we have to continue this, that would certainly make things easier. What my clerk has been doing at this point because of what has been submitted through the Odyssey and my regular clerk is not here today, her confusion yesterday in terms of whether or not anybody actually wanted hard copies to be marked and admitted, we've already had a hard copy now that we've looked at it and
discussed it. And what I told my clerk who is covering for the rest of the day was just to simply make notes and before we put any stickers on anything we want to see how we were going to proceed.

I think if ultimately we can figure out and have some stipulation that would be fantastic. If we cannot, then, obviously, folks will have to go through the motions to put them in.

MR. STERN: I am sure we will be able to stipulate on at least the majority of the documents.

THE COURT: Is there any of the PJR identified documents, Ms. Newberry, that you need to have addressed before this witness testifies?

MS. NEWBERRY: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. So well take care of that and we'll talk about the process of that when we set the new continuation date.

Why don't we go ahead and call the out-of-state witness.

MR. STERN: Our witness, Your Honor, is Ms. Fay Janati.

THE COURT: Come up to the witness stand and when you reach the chair remain standing and my clerk will swear you in.

Whereupon,

\author{
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 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: First name is Fay, F-a-y. Last name Janati, J-a-n-artri.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

\section*{DIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR STERN:
Q Good morning, Ms. Janati. Could you tell us what's your employment?

A I work for Nationstar Mortgage.
Q What is your position?
A My current position is litigation resolution analys.

Q How long have you had that position?
A Since May of 2013.
Q What are your responsibilities in that position?
A As a resolution analyst, first of all, we try to

\section*{58}
come up with resolution with everybody who is in foreclosure, or if it's litigated, contested foreclosures. So our first main goal is to come up with a resolution to keep homeowners in their property and avoid foreclosure. I also travel as a corporate witness for the company.

Q As we know from your appearance here today, correct?

A Yes.
Q You mentioned you started in this role in May of this year; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q How long have you been at Nationstar?
A I have been with Nationstar as of today, November 1st, for 15 years.

Q Can you give us a sense of what you were doing before you had this role?

A From 1998 until 2007 I was a loan officer, operation mazager, branch manager. All those positions all in origination. 2008 to 2010 I was audio assets manager. 2010 to 2013 quality control director. THE COURT: All for the same company? THE WITNESS: All for the same company.
BY MR STERN:
Q Prior to your employment with Nationstar, where
```

were you employed?
A I was working for United Lending, also called UC
Lending, as a loatn officer.
Q How long did you do that?
A Three years for UC Lending as a loan officer.
Q So about 18 years or so experience in these two
companies?
A Yes.
Q Have you become familiar with the types of
documents used in residential mortgage lending?
A I'm very.
Q Okay. So how familiar are you with promissory
notes?
A Every time I went to a closing for a loan
closing I had to look at it and put it in front of the
borrower to sign.
Q Can you tell us how familiar you are with
Nationstar's policies and procedures for keeping custody
of promissory notes?
A At Nationstar Mortgage we do use custodian of
the note and the procedure at Nationstar and most other
lenders, which is knowe in the mortgage industry since I
have been in the industry, over 20 years, after
origination happens the original note itself it goes to
the custodian to be kept there. It stays there until

```
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either the borrower takes offers on and the loan is
released of duties, or for, unfortunately, a foreclosure
if you do need to produce the original note.

Q Are you familiar with a custodial loan arrangement for the loan we're here for today, Ms. Rodriguez' loan?

A Yes, sir. It looks like from the date that we boarded this account in our system, which was 8 of 2011 , the custodian of the note was US Bank.

Q You mentioned a term there that I would like for you to explain. You said "we." Who do you mean by we?

A Nationstar Mortgage.
Q And you also said "boarded" this account. Can you tell us what you mean by that.

A Nationstar, First Horizon Loan Mortgage gave us thousands of loans to do the servicing on. First Horizon has always been the master servicer of the account and they transferred the servicing to us. Now Nationstar is subservicer of this account since 8 of 2011.

Q Okay. Explain what, as a subservicer, Nationstar Mortgage does.

A As a subservicer everything that relates to the servicing of the loam; taking payments, talking to the borrower. The minute the loan is boarded, we are live, we are calling the borrower. We do send them a welcome
letter. The borrower is well aware who is Nationstar, The homeowner receives goodbye letter from First Horizon and welcome letter from Nationstar.

Q What role, if any, does the servicer have when you strike their foreclosure?

A If the borrower is delinquent, generally speaking depending on the state, the servicer, when the loan can go to delinquency, the timeline starts, the demand letter goes out. And, again, depending on the state law and regulation, depending on delinquency, first a demand letter goes out, then it is referred to foreclosure attomey and then while you are still talking to the customer foreclosure starts according to delinquency.

Q Okay. And can you tell us which party handles all of those steps that you identified.

A Our subservicer, Nationstar Mortgage.
Q We heard testimony earlier today that Ms. Rodriguez, in her testimony, that Nationstar owns the loan. Can you tell us who owns this loan?

A The owner of the note is Bank of New Your Melon, BONY, and they are the investor of the toan. First Horizon was the master servicer and now we are the subservicer.

Q And by we, again, you mean Nationstar?

A Nationstar.
Q So what ownership interest, if any, does Nationstar have in the loan?

A We have power of attorney to continue foreclosure and service the foan.

Q Okay. But in terms of economic ownership of the loan how much, if any, does Nationstar have?

A None.
Q You mentioned that the loan was boarded in August of 2011?

A Yes.
Q What was Nationstar's relationship or role in Ms. Rodriguez' loan before August of 2011?

A Nothing.
Q Okay. Now, do you know who had the service of subservicing responsibility before Nationstar acquired it?

A Met Life.
Q And in 2011 can you tell us approximately how many loans, other than Ms. Rodriguez' loan, were service transferred from MetLife to Nationstar?

A I don't know how many. But it was a blg servicing job to transfer. Thousands of loans were iransferred to us.

Q What I am trying to get at is whether
Ms. Rodriguez' loan was treated uniquely?
    A No, not at all. It was worded correctly. The
amounts are right. The UPB is right. We didn't have any
issues.
    Q Okay. So what documents when MetLife did the
service transfer of Ms. Rodriguez' loan along with, as
you said, thousands of others, what documents were
transferred to Nationstar as part of that?
    A Usually when the transfer of loan happens all
the previous servicer documents are electronically
transferred to us and we do keep it in an electronic
fling imaging system.

Q Can you tell us what those electronic documents consist of?

A The payment history, loan origination documents, whatever they had they transferred to us and we keep it in an imaging system.

Q How about documents like the promissory note; what is done with those?

A The promissory note stays with the custodiam. It does not move around. It stays with the original note.

Q And is that what happened in this case?
A Yes, sir.
Q. You mentioned an image file. Can you tell us
whether that image file includes copies of the promissory note?

A Yes, sir. Copies of the note, copies of deed of trust, copies of loan origination package.

Q Are there any documents that the borrower signed that are not part of that image file?

A I don't know, Most likely no. We get all the documents from the previous servicer, but I did not look at every document at loan origination, but I trust they're there.

Q Can you explain to us, you mentioned foreclosure as one of the servicing functions. Can you explain to us what Nationstar does -- before I ask you that, I am going to withdraw and ask another question.

Can you tell us what the status of
Ms. Rodriguez' loan was when Nationstar acquired it in August of 2011?

A Yes, sir. The loan was due for 2009 and it was already in forectosure. So we picked up the servicing transfer from MetLife, loan was already in foreclosure status.

Q Can you tell us what Nationstar does as a servicer in performing said foreclosure to verify that it follows the proper steps in the foreclosure process.

A Foreclosure Department, first of all, the
policies and procedures are in place for the Foreclosure Department to follow the steps and they do get audited very often and the accounting is watched.

What happens is if the loan is already in foreclosure we contact our foreclosure attorney. We talk about where are you, what do you need, what documents do you need, and we just proceed with foreclosure with our foreclosure attorneys.

Q Was that a process since this loan was alrcady in foreclosure can you tell us what Nationstar did specifically with its handling of Ms. Rodriguez' loan when it acquired the transfer?

A I do not know the details. But I can tell you the foreclosure rep contacted the foreclosure attorney to proceed with foreclosure.
Q. More generally speaking, Ms. Janati, can you tell us what policy procedures Nationstar follows to verify standing and move forward with foreclosure.

A To verify standing, first of all, every time a servicing is transferred, all the information is communicated with Foreclosure Department. We do bave a spreadsheef that is very reliable once the transfer is done they know who is the owner of the note, who was the previous servicer, what is the relationship with this transfer and they know who is the owner of the note by 66
looking at their document that is provided to them.
a Okay. Have you had a chance to review the copy of the promissory note that Ms. Rodriguez signed?

A The copy of the note that you showed me, yes.
Q And I will counsel you to remember not to discuss what you and I have discussed.

A Okay.
Q But you have seen a copy of the note?
A Yes.
Q What I would like to do now is present to you a copy of the note that Ms. Rodriguez testified about earlier.

A Okay.
THE COURT: Well, Ms. Rodriguez had it at the bench and I'm not sure where it went. We have the one -we made a note that we were doing it but I think we should use the copy Ms. Janati is looking at.

MR. STERN: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MR. STERN:

Q Ms. Janati, can you - I didn't make a mental note of which page it was, but do you recall from
Ms. Rodriguez' testimony that there was a stamp?
A Yes, sir.
Q Can you turn to that page.
A I am boaking at it.
```

Q Can you see on that stamp Nationstar's name on it?
A Yes.
Q I have a couple questions about that. First of all, can you tell us what, if anything, that stamp indicates about who owns this note?
A The stamp is not correct. It was done wrong. The first part of the page without record to First Horizon Mortgage, that part is correct. It needs to be there because once the loan is originated the lender puts that stamp to open the note for further securitization and this loan, First Horizon loan, was later securitizel with BONY.
The stamp of Nationstar Mortgage is incorrect and it should not be on this document. This is a copy of the note and nobody should have stamped a copy of the note with Nationstar Mortgage.
MR. STERN: If I may approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: You may.
MR. STERN: This is the original note.

```

\section*{BY MR. STERN:}
```

Q Ms. Janati, I handed you a document. Can you take a minute to look through that.
A Sure. I did.
Q Can you tell us what document this is?

```

\section*{A This is the original loan that Ms. Rodriguez at} the time she took the loan with First Horizon Mortgage.

Q If you would, Ms. Janati, would you flip the note to the last page.

A Okay,
Q And do you see that endorsement?
A Yes, sir.
Q Does the endorsement have the Nationstar stamp on it?

A No.
MR. STERN: Your Honor, we would like to THE WITNESS; The original note is correct, and it does not have any stamps or \(-m\) so this is the original note. It was never touched.

THE COURT: Counsel, this was kind of blind-sighted, but did you want take a minute to look at what it is we're talking about here?

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, I inspected that in counsel's office earlier this week and we understand that the original note had a red circle around the blank endorsement.

THE COURT: And I am now looking at what has been provided by counsel as the original note. And can I just see the copy --

THE WITNESS: Sure.

THE COURT: - so I'm looking at what we're talking about. Okay. I guess the thing that I am trying to figure out, and maybe this is the follow-up question, but the one that I am at this time holding in my left hand, which is the original note, which shows the red pen circle around the paid to the order of without recourse First Horizon Home Loan Corporation language. And then we have a copy, which doesn't contain that at all but does contain what has just been testified to as I believe the witness said made the mistake of the stamp to the right of that Nationstar LLC.

So I am just trying to distinguish between the two. So there is one affixed additional stamp to the original. Is that sort of what we are getting at?

MR. STERN: I think there is two differences, Your Honor. First of all, the original comes from the custodial file, because we are doing this witness out of order, the full foundation for where the custodial file came from is going to come from I believe McCarthy and Holthus since the custodian delivers the collateral directly to them.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STERN: But what we're doing is what you've just seen is the original as it appears in a custodial file, where the original signature would be with the
correct endorsement. What was introduced and what was admitted at the PJR Exhibit 10 earlier this morning is what was produced in the mediation that is at issue in our case today.

So what we would like to do is offer into evidence a copy of the original, which we have here so that we can keep the original in the custodial file.

THE COURT: And we talked before about not wanting to put the originals into the record. Is there any objection to this copy that has been testified to by the witness as a copy going into the record?

The point I was actually just making, sorry it was more confusing than it needed to be is that there are two distinctions between the documents which you are now offering which would be a copy that the court could review, the original and the copy to ensure they are the same of what is the original note in the custodial file which bears a red circle around it but no Nationstar stamp.

MR. STERN: Correct.
THE COURT: And the copy that Ms. Rodriguez testified that she had been provided at mediation that the witness is also looking at, had no red circle but does have the Nationstar stamp. So there's two distinctions.
```

    MR, STERN:There is essentially a third
    distinction, Your Honor, the source.
THE COURT: Talking about the physical document
right now.
MR. STERN: In terms of the physical documents
there are two distinctions.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. STERN: There is actually another
distinction, Your Honor, because the original is endorsed
on the back of the page, the image file had an additional
page bearing only the endorsement stamp, but that's just
a copy of the back side of one of the pages.
MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, if I may have the
original to do an exact comparison.
THE COURT: Please, approach the witness so you
can just do it right now.
MS. NEWBERRY: I will just take it back to my
table.
THE COURT: Would it by quicker to take the original and just make another copy right now? I'm not sure what the hold up is right now.
I appreciate and I could overhear Ms. Newberry indicating and I think she is absolutely correct, if you are going to offer a copy of the original in lieu of the original, which I'm perfectly fine with, it has to be an
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exact copy exactly the way the witness is looking at it, exactly the way l'm looking at it to go into the record.

MR. STERN: We agree, Your Honor. And I think what happened is that our office mixed the order of a couple of pages when we made the copy.

THE COURT: Is that something we can straighten out quickly or is that something that it would just be easier to take the original and go nun another copy right now?

MR. STERN: I think it is something we can straighten out, but the plaintiff's counsel has to be on board with it. So what we would like to do is present this is how it came. So just in full disclosure, Your Honor, what happened here is we obtained the collateral file; we photocopied it so that we could offer this note and in doing that we put an interest and rate addendum, couple of payes in front so the endorsement was on the last page and that is how we presented to the witness. The correct order is with the endorsement on the third to last page with the addendum in front.

THE COURT: So the copy that the Court looked at is actually the correctly made copy -

MR, STERN: Right.
THE COURT: -- from the way you received the
original, but then when you put the original back
1
together, for whatever reason, you switched out the order.

MR. STERN: Right. And I didn't actually do it, Ms. Schmidt did it, so she can confirm if I'm wrong.

MS. SCHMMDT: Yes. What happened is since the endorsement is on the back that was the last page our office copied and so when we put it back together it just got stuck at the last page as opposed to with the original.

THE COURT: Well, it looks like, Mr. Stern, you have reordered them in your hand right now with the original so that it matches what the copy is.

MR. STERN: Right.
THE COURT: Ms. Newberry, are you okay with that at this point?

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, I would just point out that a note with endorsement, especially permanently affixed in order for it to be compliant with the UCC, they are out of order. They are attaching things. I don't know if this is a true and correct copy of the original.

MR. STERN: Your Honor, I am happy to put Ms. Schmidt on the stand if we need to go there. But it is actually an incorrect statement to say that it has to be permanently affixed under the UCC. To the contrary.

It can be detached with copying. You can even have allonges that aren't part of that are detached and reattached for copying. It needs to be with the intension of permanently remaining on the docurnent. But the fact that we separated it for making a copy does not violate the UCC.

THE COURT: I don't believe it does either. The concern I believe Ms. Newberry has, I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, but I did get to the extent that a huge aspect of this matter is what is the original and what does it look like. Like you said, you have a witness, and obviously you do, who is going to testify to what was in the custodial file and what it looked like. At this point we've unclipped and reordered and done things and at the end of the day what I want is whoever is going to testify to what the original version looked like, and it looks like we had a couple of counsel who obviously have to provide candor to the tribunal, with what it looked like, let's get it back to what it looked like when you originally reccived it, which I think what you have done now, Mr. Stern, and let's make sure the copy matches that and then well move on. We will admit the copy.

MR. STERN: I think we'fe there, Your Honor. I
think there is an objection.
```

THE COURT: We have the objection and I noted the objection, but were still going to proceed.
MR. STERN: Okay.
THE COURT: I am not going to -1 don't think
it is an objection that requires any sustaining or overruling. I think it is a fair objection to make to say what are we doing monkeying around with these documents here today and prior, potentially, to today.
But the Court, again, has received and heard the testimony of counsel as to what occurred when they took the file out and copied it. I don't believe that that violates anything, let alone that it means that we cannot proceed here today.
I just want the original to be in the same order that the Court is going to admit and then you tell me what we're admitting it as. You mentioned something about calling it Number 200 or something. But how do we admit it?
MR. STERN: That is what we have now, Your Honor. And if you want to take another look.
MS. NEWBERRY: Okay. This is the copy. The only thing I would point out, the copy is in page wise in greater number than the original because there is an additional page, so it is not an exact copy, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Understood. And the only way we
could have one is because it would then have to be a two-sided copy.

MS. NEWBERRY: Just want to make sure the record reflects that.

THE COURT: But that backside copy, which is now, because it is a one-sided document, the following page is in the order in which it would appear if we were doing it as a two-sided; is that correct?

MS. NEWBERRY: I just want to make sure that that is the difference between their exhibit they are producing and the original.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We will admit that. Did you say what number you -

MR. STERN: Why don't we start with 200. This is our original.

THE COURT: We'll call that Nationstar's 200.
MR. STERN: Just a brief query on time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know what to tell you, counsel. I got trial coming at 1:00, and I have staff that needs to take a lunch. But I want to finish with this witness who is from out of state, so whatever we can do to finish with this witness, we'll do it, right.

MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, I am going to have cross-examination that's going to last longer than five
minutes.
THE COURT: Well, and I don't doubt that, and 1 don't think counsel is done here, so I don't know what to tell you guys.

THE WITNESS: I can come back. That's my job.
Set a date. I have my calendar. I can continue or come back.

THE COURT: Before we do that, conservatively, just to make sure, again, nothing here is about
shortcutting anybody. It's about getting all the evidence that we need. How much time do you think you need, Counsel? In faimess, not trying to shortcut you or not trying to rush you; how much more time do you have?

MR. STERN: Honestly, Your Honor, about 15 or 20 minutes.

THE COURT: Okay. Fair enough.
MR. STERN; I don't know how much time Ms. Schuler-Hintz needs.

THE COURT: Ms. Schuler-Hintz, how much time do you think you would have with this witness?

MS. SCHULER-HINTZ: Minimal, Your Honor. Five minutes.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Newberry,
MS. NEWBERRY: Your Honor, I would estimate at 78
least an hour.
THE COURT: And fair enough. This is a key witness. So the reality is, even though we tried our best to kind of anticipate how we might be able to do it the reality is answers take longer, review of the documents, getting documents squared away take longer. So we could potentially finish with this witucss and then go straight into our trial, but that is going to be a tricky thing for all of us to have to do.

MR. STERN: And we are trying to be considerate w you and your staff as well.

THE COURT: As am I. So what perhaps might be in our best interest is to figure out the reconvening time and just make sure at that point that we give you the day that we make sure that there is no, again, it was really unanticipated that we could have the time conflict that we have today and something I could not avoid to have my trial from earlier this week to carry over to this afternoon.

MR. STERN: And I think this is a natural breaking point -

THE COURT: I agree as well. So why don't I have the witness go ahead and step down and well figure it out. And everyone is here. Rather than me try to guess at it, right now, I do I have hearings on the 15 th
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## DISTRICT COURT

## CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CATHERINE RODRIGUEZ,
Petitioner,

V .
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLD,; METLIFE HOME LOANS; 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 FHAMS 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,

Defendants.

Case No.: A-13-685616-J
Dept:: XXV

## MOTION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL

 BRIEFING ON ORDER SHORTENING TIME

Nationstar Mortgage, LLC and Bank of New York Mellon, as trustee (BNY-Mellon, and together with Nationstar, collectively Respondents) move for supplemental briefing following the evidentiary hearing that took place on November 1, 2013 and December 13, 2013.

## DECLARATION OF ALLISON R. SCHMIDT

ALLISON R. SCHMIDT declares as follows:

1. I am a duly licensed attorney admitted to practice in the State and District of Nevada. I am the attorney of record for Defendants Nationstar Mortgage, LLC and The Bank of New YorkMellon. I make this declaration upon personal knowledge and, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the facts contained in this declaration.
2. All of the facts contained in this motion are, to the best of my knowledge, true and correct.
3. I spoke with counsel for petitioner, Tara Newberry, on December 20, 2013, who indicated to me that she did not intend to oppose this motion for additional briefing.
4. An order shortening time is necessary as the proposed briefing submission date, January 31, 2014, would pass before this motion could be heard in the ordinary course.
5. The estimated time for the hearing on respondents' Motion to for Additional Briefing would be ten (10) minutes.
6. Respondents' Motion to for Additional Briefing is made in good faith and not for the purposes of delay.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
DATED this $31^{\text {st }}$ day of December, 2013.


## ORDER SHORTENING TIME

Based on the request for an Order Shortening Time and the supporting Affidavit of Allison R. Schmidt, Esq., and good cause appearing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to for Additional Briefing will be heard on the 14 \#h day of January, 2014, at $\qquad$ before the undersigned Judge. Petitioner's response, if any is due on January $\qquad$ , 2014.
DATED this $2^{-y}$ day of January, 2014.


MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
I.

## INTRODUCTION

Following closing arguments on December 13, 2013, this Court invited the parties to file a motion for supplemental briefing, if any party felt that additional briefing would aid the Court in resolving this matter. Respondents believe additional briefing, submitted by the parties simultaneously, would aid the court in its review of the extensive factual evidence and legal arguments advanced by both petitioner and respondents during the two-day evidentiary hearing ${ }^{1}$.

## II.

## LEGAL ARGUMENT

E.D.C.R. 2.20(i) allows for supplemental briefing by order of the Court. Supplemental briefing will aid the court in the resolution of this matter. There has been no briefing submitted thus far, other than briefing on the original petition for judicial review, which dealt primarily with the timeliness of the petition. The parties have not briefed the factual issues covered in the evidentiary hearing, nor have they briefed the legal points relevant to petitioner's claims.

[^0]Respondents request this court order supplemental briefing. First, supplemental briefing is necessary on the legal standard for sanctions in a petition for judicial review of a foreclosure mediation. Petitioner conflates sanctions in a judicial review with punitive damages in a civil action. These are separate remedies, subject to differing legal standards. Second, the Court overruled many of respondents' objections but reserved judgment on the weight of the evidence. Supplemental briefing would aid the Court in determining the weight to be given to the substantial amount of evidence that was presented by both parties over the two-day hearing. Third, petitioner made numerous statements that (1) misstated the contents of the pooling and servicing agreement, (2) misstated Nationstar and BNY-Mellon's sources of income ${ }^{2}$, and (3) extrapolated the facts of this case to all other foreclosure mediations involving Nationstar or BNY-Mellon. None of the evidence supports these statements, and supplemental briefing would assist the Court to determine which of petitioner's claims actually have evidentiary support.

Finally, petitioner's closing remarks included a lengthy testimony from her counsel regarding the facts and history of this case, and the previous servicing of this loan. Petitioner, through her counsel, presented these facts in the form of a closing argument, not through admissible evidence. Respondents are entitled to rebut this attempt to offer evidence in the guise of a closing argument.

The court clerk has informed counsel for respondents that the transcript of this matter will likely not be available until the first or second week of January. Since the transcript will be integral to the parties' supplemental briefing, respondents believe that a submission deadline of 3:00 p.m. on Friday, January 31, 2014 would give the parties sufficient time to review the transcript and submit their briefs simultaneously.

## III.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, respondents respectfully request this Court order supplemental briefing on this matter, to be submitted no later than January 31, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. and that no

[^1]findings of fact or conclusions of law issue in this matter until the Court has had the opportunity to review the supplemental briefs submitted by the parties.
DATED this 31st day of December, 2013.

## AKERMAN LLP

/s/ Allison R. Schmidt, Esq.
ARIEL E. STERN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 8276
ALLISON R. SCHMIDT, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 10743
1160 Town Center Drive, Suite 330
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144
Attorneys for Nationstar Mortgage LLC
and Bank of New York Mellon

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

HEREBY CERTIFY that on the $2 \frac{\int d}{d}$ day of January, 2014 and pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I served and deposited for mailing in the U.S. Mail a true and correct copy of the foregoing MOTION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING ON ORDER SHORTENING TIME, postage prepaid and addressed to:

VENICIA CONSIDINE, ESQ.
Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc. 725 E. Charleston Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89104
TARA D. NEWBERRY, ESQ.
Connaghan Newberry Law Firm
7854 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89117
Attorneys for Petitioner
KRISTIN A. SCHULER-HINTZ, ESQ.
McCarthy \& Holthus, LLP
9510 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 200
Las Vegas, NV 89117
Attorneys for Defendant
The Bank of New York Mellon
f/k/a The Bank of New York
/s/ Adam Crawford
An employee of AKERMAN LLP


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Counsel for respondents contacted Tara Newberry, Esq. on December 20, 2013 regarding their intent to file this motion. In that telephone conversation, Ms. Newberry said she would not oppose this motion. \{27661823;2\}

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ While it is respondents' position that the financial circumstances of both Nationstar and BNY-Mellon are irrelevant, BNY-Mellon's financials are additionally irrelevant because BNY-Mellon is not the owner of the loan, it is the trustee of the loan pool which owns Ms. Rodriguez's loan.
    \{27661823;2\}
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