IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

LN MANAGEMENT LLC SERIES 5105 PORTRAITS PLACE,

Appellant,

v.

GREEN TREE LOAN SERVICING, LLC, Respondent.

Electronically Filed Aug 12 2016 10:19 a.m. Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court

Case No. 69477

RESPONDENT'S APPENDIX

APPEAL from the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS E. SMITH District Court Case No. A-13-679816-C

RESPONDENT'S APPENDIX

COLT B. DODRILL, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 9000
WOLFE & WYMAN LLP
6757 Spencer Street
Las Vegas, NV 89119
cbdodrill@wolfewyman.com
Phone (702) 476-0100
Fax (702) 476-0101

Counsel for Respondent Green Tree Servicing LLC, now known as Ditech Financial LLC

APPENDIX INDEX

I.	ffidavit of Service of Summons and Complaint in Intervention	
	regarding service of LN Management LLC Series 5105 Portraits Place	
	(1 page)1	
II.	Affidavit of Service of Summons and Complaint in Intervention	
	regarding service of Portraits at Painted Desert Homeowners	
	Association (1 page)	
III.	Transcript of Proceedings of Green Tree Servicing LLC's Motion for	
	Summary Judgment, August 11, 2015 (8 pages)	
IV.	Transcript of Proceedings of Green Tree Servicing LLC's Motion for	
	Summary Judgment, August 18, 2015 (4 pages)	

Aponey or Party without Aponey:				For Court Use Only
COLT B. DODRILL, ESQ. NBN 9000 WOLFE & WYMAN LLP	8° X			
980 KELLY JOHNSON DR., STE. 140	3			
LAS VEGAS, NV 89119	,			
	(%: 702-476-0101			
Assoracy for: Plaintiff, IN INTERVENOR		Kef. No. or File No		
Invert name of Court, and Judicial District and Br	ranch Court:			
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COU	RT, CLARK COUNT)	ANEVADA		
Plainigg: LN MANAGEMENT LLC SER Defendant: WILLIAM WEBSTER	IES 5105 PORTRAITS	SPLACE		
AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE	Hearing Date:	Time:	Dept/Div:	Case Number:
······································				A-13-679816-C
. At the time of service I was at least 18	years of age and not a	t party to this a	ction.	
. I served copies of the SUMMONS, C	OMPLAINT IN INTE	RVENTION		
l. a. Party served:		AGEMENT LL S PORTRAITS		PORTRAITS PLACE, AS TRUSTEE
b. Person served:				to NRS 14.020 as a person of suitable at
			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	address is of the resident agent as show
	on the cur	rent certificate	of designation fil	ed with the Secretary of State.
t. Address where the party was served:	nh MR T	NCORPORATI	mv nic	
to caused this existing to ever from the exemple of a constitution.		RED AGENT	CONTRACTOR	
	364 TERI	RACE VIEW D	RIVE	
	STATELJ	INE, NV 89449)	
 I served the party: a. by personal service. I personally deprecess for the party (1) on: Thu., A 			Σ to the party or p	person authorized to receive
7. Person Who Served Papers:		Fee	for Service:	
a. TONI L. RUCKMÁN (R-052005)			•	erjury under the laws of the State of
b. FIRST LEGAL INVESTIGATION	ONS	NEVADA	that the foregoin	g is true and correct.
NEVADA PI/PS LICENSE 1452	, 1/1	A+	Commenter of the second	And the second second
704 S. 6TH STREET LAS VEGAS, NV 89101	1/1/0.4	B A	$1/MM_{\odot}$	AMANN.
c. (702) 671-4002	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	3	Salaman Salaman Salaman (1)	
	فهديد من ينجد في	,	V	original and the second
90000			Jacobs.	
				DAWN E. REELLY 3
			30	NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF NEVADA
				Signal Asy Commission Expires: 05-01-16 \$
	, serving		Parket States	rational and the Committee of the Commit
	1111.		🕏	
8. STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF	1 10, 11	É	1.	× 5°
		anang Manasa sast	MOL	by TONIL, RUCKMAN (R-
Subscribed and sworn to (or affirme	uj vejvre me on mis		military military and the second	William Of Assistant Company of the
proved to me on the basis of satisfac	tory evidence to be the	person who ap	peared before m	re.

Fri, May. 01, 2015

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE (Notary Signature) 55/08 molfin.698491

Garesy or Party without Attorney: COLT B. DODRILL, ESQ. NBN 9000			a managan kananan salah kanan ka	For Court Use Only
WOLFE & WYMAN LLP 980 KELLY JOHNSON DR., STE. 140		,		
LAS VEGAS, NV 89119 dephone No: 702-476-0100 FAX	No: 702-476-0101			
iorney for: Plaintiff, IN INTERVENOR		Kef, No. or File No.:		
sert name of Court, and Judicial District and Bro		5		
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COUR amage: LN MANAGEMENT LLC SERI				
AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE	Bearing Date:	Time:	Depi/Div:	Case Number:
				A-13-679816-C
I served copies of the SUMMONS; Co a. Party served:			D DESERT H	OMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
5. Person served:	EDWINA of suitable	DALY, COMM age and discreti	UNITY MANA	GER/pursuant to NRS 14.020 as a per address, which address is of the reside of designation filed with the Secretary of
Address where the party was served:	OF NEV. 4576 N. F	c/o EUGENE BURGER MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF NEVADA - L.V., REGISTERED AGENT 4576 N. RANCHO DR. #100 LAS VEGAS, NV 89130		
I served the party: a. by personal service. I personally deprocess for the party (1) on: Wed., A	5		io the party or ;	person authorized to receive
Person Who Served Papers:	A.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	or Service:	
a, DEANNE R. BELTRAN (R-06734 b. FIRST LEGAL INVESTIGATIO	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			erjury under the laws of the State of gis true and correct.
NEVADA PI/PS LICENSE #1452 704 S. 6TH STREET	5/	1115 3		
LAS VEGAS, NV 89101 c. 702-671-4002	Date) }	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Signuture)
	Date)	{	Signuture)
				on participat participat balt superfect for the first balt superfect for the first balt superfect for the first
				DAVIN E, REALLY NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF NEVADA

rommeen ridnee op or 10 % Contribute No. (IS-RACE) A

8. STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this

proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person who appeared before me.

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

(Notary Signature) 55938 weigh 698221

1	RTRAN	Alm to Comme		
2		CLERK OF THE COURT		
3				
4	DISTRIC	T COURT		
5	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA			
6				
7	LN MANAGEMENT LLC SERIES 5105 (PORTRAITS PLACE,) CASE NO. A679816		
8	Plaintiff,) DEPT. VIII		
9				
10	VS.			
11	WILLIAM WEBSTER,			
12	Defendant.			
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS E. SMITH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE			
14	TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2015			
15		F PROCEEDINGS		
16	GREEN TREE SERVICING LLC 5 W	OTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT		
17 18				
19	APPEARANCES:			
20	For the Plaintiff:	KERRY P. FAUGHNAN, ESQ.		
21				
22	For the Intervenor,	YANXIONG LI, ESQ.		
23	Green Tree Loan Servicing LLC:	TANAIONG LI, ESQ.		
24	RECORDED BY: JILL JACOBY, COURT	RECORDER		
25	TRANSCRIBED BY: JUDY CHAPPELL, COURT RECORDER			
	1			

THE COURT: LN Management versus Webster. Hey.

MR. FAUGHNAN: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. FAUGHNAN: Kerry Faughnan on behalf of LN Management.

MR. LI: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael Li, behalf of Green Tree Servicing LLC.

THE COURT: All right. Your Motion for Summary Judgment.

MR. LI: Yeah. Yes, Your Honor. This is Green Tree Servicing's Motion for Summary Judgment based on violation of the bankruptcy stay that was filed by Mr. and Mrs. Webster in the eastern district of Texas. And without having to detail the brief or just resummarize everything, want to just emphasize a couple points that was raised in the opposition.

With respect to standing, Your Honor, I think the fundamental bankruptcy code principle is that the automatic stay is designed to protect two different and complimentary interests. One is to protect the debtor's fresh start and the other is to protect interest of the creditor with respect to the estate. So during the time of the bankruptcy, the automatic stay acts as that kind of statutory injunction, so to speak. So that any creditor that wants to take property out of the estate, out of a bowl, so to speak, has to seek relief from the bankruptcy court before they can do that. And none of that relief appears on the docket in the bankruptcy case that's before Your Honor. Certainly not by the HOA or the trustee. Relief isn't granted in kind or as to everyone. The only relief that does appear is relief that's sought and successfully gained, obtained by EverBank.

And so with respect to LN Management's interest, with respect to the HOA that actually did proceed with the foreclosure, notwithstanding the bankruptcy case, that act of recording the notices and the remaining the balance of the foreclosure acts are in direct violation of the bankruptcy stay because it happened during the bankruptcy case, as the chronology shows.

With respect to jurisdiction, Your Honor, the stay originally was a product of judicial doctrine. And in 1989 when the bankruptcy act was first in – when the bankruptcy act first became enacted, so to speak, the bankruptcy court became created, that was transferred into the old Chapter 10. And it was meant to consolidate everything and make sure that we have uniform law with respect to how when you have a bankruptcy, claims and liability are determined and everything's administered in an orderly fashion.

And so bankruptcy power really derives from Title 28. And if you look at Title 28 under Section 1334, it says that, it says pretty clearly that original and exclusive jurisdiction over all cases but original and nonexclusive jurisdiction as to proceedings in a case.

Your Honor, proceedings in the context of a bankruptcy case are, for instance, motion practice, motions for relief from automatic stay, motions for annulment, things of that nature, which are instituted as a matter of bankruptcy Rule 9014. Another example would be Part VII adversary proceedings which are essentially independent lawsuits within the bankruptcy case. While the bankruptcy has jurisdiction over the entire case to administer the assets, disputes, issues that arise within the bankruptcy case may be heard, if the bankruptcy court allows during the time that the bankruptcy is ongoing by other tribunals. And so there's no issue with this Court really going in and interpreting and applying the automatic

stay, especially now that the bankruptcy case has already closed.

And with – I think LN Management makes an interesting point on abandonment. It's true that when an asset is abandoned or when an asset is exempt and there has been a discharge, the asset falls out of the estate. Once the asset is out of the estate, it's no longer subject to protection of the automatic stay. However, surrender is an entirely different concept. When the – when the debtor files for bankruptcy, under 11 U.S.C. 521(a)(2), the debtor has an obligation to declare whether or not he or she, this is in the context of consumer bankruptcy, has to surrender secured assets to the creditors. In this case, secured creditors such as Green Tree's predecessors or such as HOA. And so that itself does not take the asset out of the estate. There is no abandonment, there is no order and are pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 554 which is the provision that governs abandonment. Abandonment is typically exercised by the bankruptcy trustee.

And so, with that said, unless Your Honor has any other questions, I'll reserve the rest of my time for the reply. Thank you.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. FAUGHNAN: Your Honor, I just have a few issues. First and foremost, given that the bankruptcy was in the 5th Circuit, 5th Circuit law would apply in this case. With that said, as we've argued in our brief or in our opposition, the 5th Circuit makes it void, not void – or excuse, makes it voidable, not void. There's no automatic voiding of the sale. As to standing, bankruptcy code section 362 very clearly gives standing to the debtor and the trustee of the bankruptcy. They're the only two parties that have standing to bring a violation issue. The – in this case, Greentree doesn't even have standing to bring this issue. We've outlined that along with cites to 5th Circuit cases.

They cite to the 9th Circuit which again doesn't apply here because it's a 5th Circuit bankruptcy. They did not address that all the acts that took place were outside of the stay. As we've pointed out, the case commenced, the parties indicated that they were going to be surrendering the Portraits Place property within 30 days of the commencement of the case. The case commenced on June 3rd, 2011, 30 days later is July – July 3rd. And the notice of default was recorded by the HOA on August 8th, 2011, clearly outside the stay. They didn't commence any – they didn't notice the trustee sale until September, or excuse me, until November 19th. On September 12th, the property was clearly abandoned out of the estate and the Nevada HOA still unknowing of the Texas bank was clear to record the sale which they did on November 19th. The sale took place on January the 23rd.

They don't address the issue of the two-year statute of limitations to bring this action. They're barred from bringing this action in and of itself by the fact that they brought it after the two years expired which would have been January 23rd of 2015.

All those things, you know, Your Honor, we've laid out pretty clearly in our briefs why this motion should be denied. Unless Your Honor has any additional questions, I think it's clear that the motion should be denied.

THE COURT: I do have some questions. First of all, jurisdiction. Even though it was – the bankruptcy was brought in Texas, this lawsuit is brought here. It's not, this is not – this is akin to another case I had. It was a death case, a rollover in Mexico, and all the witnesses were up here, the truck was brought up here, the tires were brought up here and all the witnesses, again, were here. And because they brought the suit in Nevada, I'm not using Mexican law.

So I believe jurisdiction is because it was – the choice was to bring it in Nevada, I'm going to use Nevada jurisdiction. And then in *Schwartz*, how do we get by *Schwartz*? I mean *Schwartz* says it's void.

MR. FAUGHNAN: But, Your Honor, the bankruptcy itself was – was in, they're asking for relief under –

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. FAUGHNAN: -- a bankruptcy case that's in Texas, therefore -

THE COURT: Understand. But the suit -

MR. FAUGHNAN: -- applying Tex -

THE COURT: -- the suit was brought here. And so I'm going to use 9th Circuit. Unless you have a case that says I should use 5th Circuit.

MR. FAUGHNAN: Well, Your Honor, I think -

THE COURT: You brought – you brought the suit here. I mean, they could have brought the suit in, you could have brought the suit in Texas saying – and use the 5th Circuit, but you didn't. You chose here. So I'm going to use 9th Circuit. I don't know any of the –

MR. FAUGHNAN: But even with that, --

THE COURT: -- the Texas law.

MR. FAUGHNAN: -- Your Honor --

THE COURT: Huh?

MR. FAUGHNAN: Even with that, they don't have standing to bring. They don't have standing to bring this.

THE COURT: It doesn't matter whether they had standing or not. Under *Schwartz*, the sale is void, if it violated bankruptcy, period.

MR. FAUGHNAN: If -

MR. LI: And just to clarify a couple of other points, 549 has to do with
fraudulent transfer, postpetition fraudulent transfer. And 362 of the code is what
we're going under as to the automatic stay provision. And so with respect to, for
instance, the statute of limitations argument that there's no counterpart under 362
as to any kind of statute of limitation to bring a violation of bankruptcy stay.

MR. FAUGHNAN: Your Honor, if that's – if that's the case, Your Honor, then I would ask that you continue this to allow us to go to bankruptcy court to retroactively annul the stay which we've done in other cases.

THE COURT: Well that should have been done if - I mean -

MR. FAUGHNAN: Well we were under, operating under the assumption that 5th Circuit law applies. It that's the – if Your Honor's going to apply --

THE COURT: Have you any – any case that says I should go under 5th Circuit? I don't see any –

MR. FAUGHNAN: I could brief it, Your Honor. I have not briefed it.

THE COURT: If you want to brief it. Because I believe that 9th Circuit – well, I know that 9th Circuit, I have other cases where a bankruptcy statute was violated and the 9th Circuit says void, period.

MR. FAUGHNAN: Then I -

THE COURT: So if you want to brief that issue, that's the issue that I have right now is whether –

MR. FAUGHNAN: And I would ask also that you'll allow us to – the ample time to go back to the bankruptcy court and ask them to reopen the case and annul the --

MR. LI: Your Honor, if I may interject, we did have – this issue is pretty clear on the existing briefing. And if there's --

1	THE COURT: Let me – let me look at the briefing again. If you want to file		
2	something else, give me a week and I'll have an answer for you in a week.		
3	MR. FAUGHNAN: Do you want us to rebrief it, Your Honor?		
4	THE COURT: Yeah, if you want. If you want to file sometime. I'm going to		
5	go back and read the briefing, as I sit here, on the standing issue		
6	MR. FAUGHNAN: Very good.		
7	THE COURT: and which law to apply. All right?		
8	MR. FAUGHNAN: Thank you , Your Honor.		
9	MR. LI: Thank you, Your Honor.		
10	THE COURT: Be back in one week.		
11	MR. FAUGHNAN: You want us back here or?		
12	THE COURT: Yeah.		
13	THE CLERK: August 18 th , at 8 a.m.		
14			
15	[Proceeding concluded at 8:12 a.m.]		
16			
17	ATTEST: I hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/visual		
18	recording in the above-entitled case.		
19	Judy Chappell Judy Chappell		
20	Court Recorder		
21			
22			

24

25

Electronically Filed 06/30/2016 02:11:28 PM

1	RTRAN	Alm to Chum	
2		CLERK OF THE COURT	
3			
4			
5	DISTRIC	T COURT	
6	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	TUESDAY, AU <i>Transcript oi</i> Green tree s i	CASE NO. A679816 DEPT. VIII S E. SMITH, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GUST 18, 2015 F PROCEEDINGS ERVICING LLC'S IMARY JUDGMENT	
18			
19	APPEARANCES:		
20	For the Plaintiff:	KERRY P. FAUGHNAN, ESQ.	
21 22	For the Defendant:	MATTHEW I. KNEPPER, ESQ. YANXIONG LI, ESQ.	
23			
24			
25	RECORDED BY: JILL JACOBY, COURT	RECORDER	
- 1	I .		

after it to see if he can get it off the computer.

25

MR. FAUGHNAN: Well, I think, Your Honor, I think it resolves this to the point that you will have to deny their motion for summary judgment.

MR. LI: Your Honor, I'd have to disagree. The supplemental contains no additional authority. The only two authorities I can recall that's cited in the supplemental are the ones that are in the original opposition regarding 549 post petition avoidance of the lien. And as we've argued before during the initial hearing, that's really not at issue. We're talking about 362 as interpreted by *Schwartz*, and that gives the creditor standing.

MR. FAUGHNAN: Actually, Your Honor, what we're talking about is the fact that the bank has no standing to oppose whether the stay was violated or not. It's very clearly -- even in the Ninth Circuit it's very clear that the only two people that have standing to raise a stay violation are the debtor and the trustee neither of which the bank is. Therefore, they don't even have standing to bring this motion.

MR. LI: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Yeah, but my reading of Schwartz is very clear. Whether they have standing or not, in Nevada it's void. In the Ninth Circuit, it's void.

MR. FAUGHNAN: But someone standing has to raise that issue, Your Honor, it's -- it's --

THE COURT: Yeah. Well, I'll look at --

MR. FAUGHNAN: -- and they can't.

THE COURT: I'll look at that.

MR. LI: Your Honor, Green Tree has standing because we're talking about standing two prongs. We're talking about constitutional prudential standing. Green Tree stands to lose its deed of trust if the actions by the HOA in violation of the bankruptcy stay is held valid.