Open Source Property

Stephen Clowney, James Grimmelmann, Michael Grynberg,
Jeremy Sheff, and Rebecca Tushnet

This build edited by Charles Duan

December 10, 2024

Contents

About This Book

Open Source Property is a free casebook for the first-year Property Law course at American law schools, and anyone else with an interest in the subject. The contents of the book are available at *link*.

Copyright

Typeface and Editing Conventions

To help make different parts of the book easier to identify, two fonts are used throughout. Text in this serif font is used for cases, law review articles, and other readings drawn from other sources and included in this book. In these readings, not all alterations will necessarily be noted. In particular, citations will often be removed for ease of reading. To quote the policy of one of the casebook's authors:

> My editorial technique is borrowed from Sweeney Todd: extensive and shocking cuts. These are pedagogical materials, not a legal brief. I have not put words in anyone else's mouth, but I have been unconcerned with the usual editorial apparatus of ellipses and brackets. I drop words from sentences, sentences from paragraphs, paragraphs from opinions – all with no indication that anything is gone. I also reorder paragraphs and sometimes sentences as needed to improve the readability of a passage. My goal is to make it easy for the reader. If it matters to you what the original said, consult the original.

JAMES GRIMMELMANN, PATTERNS OF INFORMATION LAW 32 (version 1.1 2017), *link*. Note the font used in this quote, since it is drawn from an external source.

Text in this sans serif font is "editorial content," namely introductory or narrative material written by the authors and editors of the book. In some cases, this material is intended to elucidate the readings and provoke thoughts and questions. In other cases, the text summarizes key doctrinal or legal concepts, in order to be more efficient (i.e., so you have to read less).

The font convention is followed as rigorously as possible. In particular, some of the readings will include footnotes from the original text, as well as footnotes added by the editors. These footnotes can be distinguished by the font being used (as well as the notation "—Eds." at the end of the footnote).

Part I

Transferring Property

Chapter 1

Security Interests

Money and property always seem to go together. A common way of joining the two is the **security interest**, in which one person's property right is used as security to guarantee a debt.

Consider the following: Alice needs to borrow money to buy a printing press (to run her newspaper business), and Bob has cash to lend. In exchange for the loan, Alice promises to pay Bob in monthly installments, with interest. But Bob is worried—what if Alice skips town and stops making the payments? So Bob wants to use the printing press as collateral for the loan. If Alice fails to make a payment, that is, if she **defaults**, Bob gets to keep the printing press, which Bob can hopefully sell for enough money to recover the value of the loan.

Alice and Bob could make these arrangements purely by contract, of course. But what if Alice first sells the printing press to Charlie, and then skips town and stops making the payments? Bob cannot sue Charlie for breach of a contract to which Charlie was not a party. Bob's only option is to sue Alice for breach of contract and hope that Alice can pay (if Bob can even find her).

So what Bob really wants is a property right in the printing press. Not a current right to use it (that's what Alice needs), but a right to take it in the event of a default. Like a reversion or remainder to a life estate that converts into a possessory estate upon the life tenant's death, Bob's desired property interest should convert into a possessory right to the printing press upon the event of a default.

In other words, *a security interest is simply a type of future interest*, and all the mechanics of the system of estates will help to explain the mechanics of security interests. There will be complications, of course, which this chapter will explore. But the basic framework will be the same: there will be current possessory estates and future interests, and certain events will change those interests by operation of law.

Security interests can arise in a variety of ways, either voluntarily (where a property owner uses the property as collateral for a loan) or involuntarily (for example, to collect on tax debts or tort judgments). A voluntary security interest on real property is typically called a "mortgage," and (somewhat confusingly) the phrase "secured transaction" in the United States generally refers to voluntary security interests in personal property under Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code. The term "lien" is typically used for involuntary security interests, though it is sometimes used interchangeably with "security interest."[1]

Our focus in this chapter will be less on the formation of these security interests, and more on how they work: what happens when a default occurs, if the underlying property is sold, and so on. Pay close attention to what interests everyone holds, who has possession when, what events affect the parties' property interests, and what legal procedures must be followed.

1.1 Liens

Williams v. Ford Motor Credit Co.

674 F.2d. 717 (8th Cir. 1982)

BENSON, Chief Judge.

In this diversity action brought by Cathy A. Williams to recover damages for conversion arising out of an alleged wrongful repossession of an automobile, Williams appeals from a judgment notwithstanding the verdict entered on motion of defendant Ford Motor Credit Company (FMCC). In the same case, FMCC appeals a directed verdict in favor of third party defendant S & S Recovery, Inc. (S & S) on FMCC's third party claim for indemnification. We affirm the judgment n.o.v. FMCC's appeal is thereby rendered moot.

In July, 1975, David Williams, husband of plaintiff Cathy Williams, purchased a Ford Mustang from an Oklahoma Ford dealer. Although David Williams executed the sales contract, security agreement, and loan papers, title to the car was in the name of both David and Cathy Williams. The car was financed through the Ford dealer, who in turn assigned the paper

[1] Unfortunately, this terminology is not standardized as a general matter, and different pockets of law may use these terms differently.

to FMCC. Cathy and David Williams were divorced in 1977. The divorce court granted Cathy title to the automobile and required David to continue to make payments to FMCC for eighteen months. David defaulted on the payments and signed a voluntary repossession authorization for FMCC. Cathy Williams was informed of the delinquency and responded that she was trying to get her former husband David to make the payments. There is no evidence of any agreement between her and FMCC. Pursuant to an agreement with FMCC, S & S was directed to repossess the automobile.

On December 1, 1977, at approximately 4:30 a.m., Cathy Williams was awakened by a noise outside her house trailer in Van Buren, Arkansas.[1] She saw that a wrecker truck with two men in it had hooked up to the Ford Mustang and started to tow it away. She went outside and hollered at them. The truck stopped. She then told them that the car was hers and asked them what they were doing. One of the men, later identified as Don Sappington, president of S & S Recovery, Inc., informed her that he was repossessing the vehicle on behalf of FMCC. Williams explained that she had been attempting to bring the past due payments up to date and informed Sappington that the car contained personal items which did not even belong to her. Sappington got out of the truck, retrieved the items from the car, and handed them to her. Without further complaint from Williams, Sappington returned to the truck and drove off, car in tow. At trial, Williams testified that Sappington was polite throughout their encounter and did not make any threats toward her or do anything which caused her to fear any physical harm. The automobile had been parked in an unenclosed driveway which plaintiff shared with a neighbor. The neighbor was awakened by the wrecker backing into the driveway, but did not come out. After the wrecker drove off, Williams returned to her house trailer and called the police, reporting her car as stolen. Later, Williams commenced this action.

The case was tried to a jury which awarded her $5,000.00 in damages. FMCC moved for judgment notwithstanding the verdict, but the district court, on Williams' motion, ordered a nonsuit without prejudice to refile in state court. On FMCC's appeal, this court reversed and remanded with directions to the district court to rule on the motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict. The district court entered judgment notwithstanding the verdict for FMCC, and this appeal followed.

[1]Cathy Williams testified that the noise sounded like there was a car stuck in her yard.

Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), which Arkansas has adopted and codified as Ark.Stat.Ann. § 85-9-503 (Supp.1981), provides in pertinent part:

> Unless otherwise agreed, a secured party has on default the right to take possession of the collateral. In taking possession, a secured party may proceed without judicial process if this can be done without breach of the peace . . . .[4]

In *Ford Motor Credit Co. v. Herring*, 589 S.W.2d 584, 586 (Ark. 1979), which involved an alleged conversion arising out of a repossession, the Supreme Court of Arkansas cited Section 85-9-503 and referred to its previous holdings as follows:

> In pre-code cases, we have sustained a finding of conversion only where force, or threats of force, or risk of invoking violence, accompanied the repossession.

The thrust of Williams' argument on appeal is that the repossession was accomplished by the risk of invoking violence. The district judge who presided at the trial commented on her theory in his memorandum opinion:

> Mrs. Williams herself admitted that the men who repossessed her automobile were very polite and complied with her requests. The evidence does not reveal that they performed any act which was oppressive, threatening or tended to cause physical violence. Unlike the situation presented in *Manhattan Credit Co. v. Brewer*, *supra*, it was not shown that Mrs. Williams would have been forced to resort to physical violence to stop the men from leaving with her automobile.

In the pre-Code case *Manhattan Credit Co. v. Brewer*, S.W.2d 765 (Ark. 1961), the court held that a breach of peace occurred when the debtor and her husband confronted the creditor's agent during the act of repossession

[4]It is generally considered that the objectives of this section are (1) to benefit creditors in permitting them to realize collateral without having to resort to judicial process; (2) to benefit debtors in general by making credit available at lower costs; and (3) to support a public policy discouraging extrajudicial acts by citizens when those acts are fraught with the likelihood of resulting violence.

and clearly objected to the repossession. In *Manhattan*, the court examined holdings of earlier cases in which repossessions were deemed to have been accomplished without any breach of the peace. In particular, the Supreme Court of Arkansas discussed the case of *Rutledge v. Universal C.I.T. Credit Corp*, 237 S.W.2d 469 (Ark. 1951). In *Rutledge*, the court found no breach of the peace when the repossessor acquired keys to the automobile, confronted the debtor and his wife, informed them he was going to take the car, and immediately proceeded to do so. As the *Rutledge* court explained and the *Manhattan* court reiterated, a breach of the peace did not occur when the "Appellant [debtor-possessor] did not give his permission but he did not object." *Manhattan*, *supra*, 341 S.W.2d at 767-68; *Rutledge*, *supra*, 237 S.W.2d at 470.

We have read the transcript of the trial. There is no material dispute in the evidence, and the district court has correctly summarized it. Cathy Williams did not raise an objection to the taking, and the repossession was accomplished without any incident which might tend to provoke violence.

Appellees deserve something less than commendation for the taking during the night time sleeping hours, but it is clear that viewing the facts in the light most favorable to Williams, the taking was a legal repossession under the laws of the State of Arkansas. The evidence does not support the verdict of the jury. FMCC is entitled to judgment notwithstanding the verdict.

Heaney, Circuit Judge, dissenting.

The only issue is whether the repossession of appellant's automobile constituted a breach of the peace by creating a "risk of invoking violence." *See Ford Motor Credit Co. v. Herring*, 589 S.W.2d 584, 586 (Ark. 1979). The trial jury found that it did and awarded $5,000 for conversion. Because that determination was in my view a reasonable one, I dissent from the Court's decision to overturn it.

Cathy Williams was a single parent living with her two small children in a trailer home in Van Buren, Arkansas. On December 1, 1977, at approximately 4:30 a.m., she was awakened by noises in her driveway. She went into the night to investigate and discovered a wrecker and its crew in the process of towing away her car. According to the trial court, "she ran outside to stop them . . . but she made no *strenuous* protests to their actions." (Emphasis added.) In fact, the wrecker crew stepped between her and the car when she sought to retrieve personal items from inside it, although the men retrieved some of the items for her. The commotion created by the incident awakened neighbors in the vicinity.

Facing the wrecker crew in the dead of night, Cathy Williams did everything she could to stop them, short of introducing physical force to meet the presence of the crew. The confrontation did not result in violence only because Ms. Williams did not take such steps and was otherwise powerless to stop the crew.

The controlling law is the UCC, which authorizes self-help repossession only when such is done "without breach of the peace . . . ." Ark.Stat.Ann. § 85-9-503 (Supp.1981). The majority recognizes that one important policy consideration underlying this restriction is to discourage "extrajudicial acts by citizens when those acts are fraught with the likelihood of resulting violence." *Supra*, at 719. Despite this, the majority holds that no reasonable jury could find that the confrontation in Cathy Williams' driveway at 4:30 a.m. created a risk of violence. I cannot agree. At a minimum, the largely undisputed facts created a jury question. The jury found a breach of the peace and this Court has no sound, much less compelling, reason to overturn that determination.

Indeed, I would think that sound application of the self-help limitation might require a directed verdict in favor of Ms. Williams, but certainly not against her. If a "night raid" is conducted without detection and confrontation, then, of course, there could be no breach of the peace. But where the invasion is detected and a confrontation ensues, the repossessor should be under a duty to retreat and turn to judicial process. The alternative which the majority embraces is to allow a repossessor to proceed following confrontation unless and until violence results in fact. Such a rule invites tragic consequences which the law should seek to prevent, not to encourage. I would reverse the trial court and reinstate the jury's verdict.

Notes and Questions

1.1. True or false: Cathy Williams would have been better off if she had thrown a punch or two. What do you make of the UCC's purported policy of discouraging private extrajudicial violence? Where does *Williams* leave other single mothers facing towing crews at 4:30 AM?

1.2. Is the breach-of-the-peace test really about deterring violence, or is it a proxy for the other kinds of individual and social harms repossession can cause? If so, how good a proxy is it? Are there better ways to avoid those harms?

1.3. Notice that FMCC's lien is a property interest. One key indicium of this fact—or perhaps a component of it—is that it is freely assignable. FMCC was not the original lender. Who was? How did FMCC end up owning the lien?

1.4. On the other side of the loan, Cathy Williams was not the original borrower; David Williams was. Why is his failure to pay her problem? Indeed, he was under a court order to continue making payments. Why doesn't that protect her from repossession? This aspect of liens—that they run with the property – is considered crucial to secured lending. Why? Would FMCC be willing to extend credit in the first place if its resulting security interest did not bind David's successors in title?

1.5. In *Williams* the lienholder is not in physical possession of the collateral. Why not? Would car loans work if the lender retained possession? This creates two distinctive problems. First, how and when the lender can retake possession? (Answer: with a tow truck in the middle of the night.) But what if Cathy Williams drives the car out of state and hides it? For that matter, what if she destroys it rather than let FMCC repossess it? So FMCC's property interest in the car provides some protection for its contract rights, but hardly perfect protection. Could FMCC insist that Cathy Williams install a GPS device on the car that continually broadcasts its location? *Cf. Am. Car Rental, Inc. v. Comm'r of Consumer Prot.*, 869 A.2d 1198 (Conn. 2005) (unfair consumer practice for car rental agency to charge customer $150 per instance of drivng over 79 miles per hour for more than two mintues, as revealed by GPS tracker in car). Are there privacy concerns with this type of close monitoring? Safety concerns? Are these more or less severe than if the lender sent employees to personally follow Cathy Williams around and keep tabs on the car? What about a kill-switch that automatically shuts down the car's engine if it is driven more than fifty miles from her house? If FMCC can shut down the car remotely, could someone else? *See* Andy Greenberg, *Hackers Remotely Kill a Jeep on the Highway—With Me In It*, WIRED (July 21, 2015), *link*.

1.6. The second distinctive problem when the lienholder is out of possession is notice to third parties. What happens if Cathy Williams sells the car without informing the buyer of the lien? Yes, this is yet another good-faith-purchaser problem; they are everywhere in property law. Consider the following case:

M&I Western State Bank v. Wilson

493 N.W.2d 387 (Wisc. Ct. App. 1992)

ANDERSON, Judge.

Darin Treleven appeals from a judgment of the trial court which awarded possession of a truck owned by Marilyn A. Wilson to the M & I Western State Bank (bank). Because the earlier release of the truck was a conditional release and the bank had notice of Treleven's lien through his possession of the truck, we reverse.

The bank holds a security interest in a 1978 Peterbilt truck owned by Wilson. Treleven repaired the truck seven times, each time releasing the vehicle to Wilson so she could earn the money to pay Treleven for the repairs. The repairs were invoiced between November 20, 1990 and April 23, 1991.

After Wilson defaulted on her payments to the bank, the bank commenced a replevin action. The parties made a repayment agreement; however, Wilson again defaulted and the bank obtained a judgment of replevin on April 9, 1990. The sheriff attempted to enforce the judgment but was unable to locate the truck. On May 12, 1991, employees of the bank saw the vehicle and followed it to Treleven's place of business, D.T. Truck Repair, Inc. The sheriff again tried to serve the writ of execution, but Treleven refused to release the vehicle, asserting that he held a mechanic's lien for services rendered.

After the attempted levy, the bank filed a second replevin action to determine who was entitled to possession of the truck and named Treleven as a third-party defendant. At the date of the hearing, Treleven still was owed $3497.26 for the repairs plus $1273.10 for interest and storage as of the date of the hearing, January 30, 1992. The bank's balance as of January 2, 1992 was $3032.16. The bank's estimate of the value of the truck is approximately $3000. If this estimate is correct, only the lien with first priority would be paid from the proceeds of the sale of the truck.

The trial court held that Treleven's release of the vehicle to Wilson constituted a waiver of Treleven's lien as to the bank and that the bank's lien had priority. The trial court ordered the bank to take possession and conduct a sale of the truck. On appeal, Treleven argues that the conditional release of the truck to the owner does not amount to a waiver of the lien and, alternatively, that he should be able to recover from the bank on the theory of unjust enrichment. Because we agree that the conditional release and regained possession do not waive Treleven's mechanic's lien or affect its priority over the prior secured interest, we do not have to address Treleven's unjust enrichment claim.

It is not disputed that before Treleven released possession of the truck, he had a mechanic's lien on Wilson's truck. Section 779.41(1), Stats., governs mechanic's liens and states in part:

> Every mechanic and every keeper of a garage or shop, and every employer of a mechanic who transports, makes, alters, repairs or does any work on personal property at the request of the owner or legal possessor of the personal property, has a *lien on the personal property* for the just and reasonable charges therefor, including any parts, accessories, materials or supplies furnished in connection therewith and *may retain possession of the personal property until the charges are paid.* [Emphasis added.]

It also is not disputed that before Treleven released the truck to Wilson, Treleven's mechanic's lien had priority over the bank's security interest. Section 409.310, Stats., states:

> When a person in the ordinary course of his business furnishes services or materials with respect to goods subject to a security interest, *a lien upon goods in the possession of such person given by statute or rule of law for such materials or services takes priority over a perfected security interest* unless the lien is statutory and the statute expressly provides otherwise. [Emphasis added.]

Section 409.310 gave Treleven's mechanic's lien priority over the security interest because Treleven was in possession of the truck, Treleven's lien was created by sec. 779.41(1), Stats., and sec. 779.41(1) does not expressly address the priority given to the lien created.

The issue in this case is whether the mechanic, by allowing the owner to use her vehicle on a temporary basis before paying the repair bill, lost the lien or its priority on that vehicle. The interpretation of statutes is a question of law which we review de novo. We first must examine the language of sec. 779.41(1), Stats., to see if the relinquishment and resumption of possession have any affect on the existence of Treleven's mechanic's lien. Section 779.41(1) provides that a mechanic "may retain possession of the personal property until the charges are paid." This provision allows the mechanic to keep a customer's property until the mechanic has been paid, without a court order. However, once the mechanic has relinquished possession of the vehicle, this statute does not provide the mechanic with a remedy even if the bill has not been paid. The statute also does not tell us whether the mechanic must retain possession of the vehicle to retain the lien—it states only that the mechanic "may retain possession."

But the mechanic's lien statute may not be interpreted in a vacuum. "[M]echanic's lien laws provide *new and additional remedies* to those of the common law and are to be liberally construed to accomplish their equitable purpose of aiding materialmen and laborers to obtain compensation for material used and services bestowed upon property of another and thereby enhancing its value." *Wiedenbeck–Dobelin Co. v. Mahoney*, 152 N.W. 479, 481 (Wisc. 1915) (emphasis added). Accordingly, in addition to the statutory language of sec. 779.41(1), Stats., we may look to the common law of mechanic's liens and those Wisconsin decisions incorporating common law principles into the statutory mechanic's lien law to determine whether Treleven's lien survives.

Treleven argues that according to *Sensenbrenner v. Mathews*, 3 N.W. 599, 600 (Wis. 1879), the delivery of the vehicle to the owner must be both voluntary and unconditional in order to constitute a waiver of the lien. Treleven maintains that because he returned the vehicle to the owner so she could pay for the repairs and the allowed use was only on a temporary basis, the delivery of the vehicle was conditional and his lien survives. The bank also relies on *Sensenbrenner* for its argument that Treleven waived his lien by releasing the vehicle to Wilson. Alternatively, the bank asserts that even if the lien was not destroyed between Treleven and Wilson when the vehicle was conditionally released to Wilson, the lien was destroyed as to third persons.

Because *Sensenbrenner* is distinguishable on its facts from the present case, neither party's reliance on that case is warranted. The court in *Sensenbrenner* found that the delivery of a buggy by the mechanic to the owner was unconditional and held that this unconditional delivery operated as a waiver of the lien. In contrast, Treleven's release of the vehicle was conditional—*Sensenbrenner* says nothing of the effect of a conditional release to the owner. *Sensenbrenner* also does not explicitly hold that the only way to waive a lien is through the voluntary and unconditional release of the property; *Sensenbrenner* merely states that this is one way to waive a lien. For these reasons, *Sensenbrenner* is not controlling precedent based on the facts of this case.

No Wisconsin court has decided whether the lien is lost once the mechanic conditionally releases the vehicle to the owner. The general and modern rule can be found in Restatement of Security § 80 (1941). This rule states that when the bailor (owner) is under an obligation to return the vehicle to the lienor (mechanic), the lien is revived upon the recovery of the vehicle, subject only to the interests of bona fide purchasers for value and attaching or levying creditors who do not have notice of the lienor's interest.

The bank would like a rule that upon a conditional release, the lien is lost as to all third parties. The Restatement reflects a more balanced view, recognizing that not all interests of third parties are affected by the conditional release. While the mechanic retains possession, third parties at least would have constructive notice of the mechanic's lien because they would be expected to examine the property in the mechanic's possession and be expected to know of the mechanic's lien statute. After a conditional release, those parties purchasing the vehicle, extending new credit, or levying on the vehicle would be vulnerable because even after examinations of the motor vehicle filings and the vehicle, there would be no way for them to know of the mechanic's prior interest. A creditor whose interest arose before the mechanic's lien would not have this concern. At the time the creditor extends credit, it is presumed to know the mechanic's lien statutes which could subordinate its interest to that of a mechanic making a later repair. This is a known risk to the creditor. A creditor also has the opportunity to protect itself by writing into the security agreement that all subsequent repairs must be approved by the creditor.

Once the mechanic's lien arises, in most circumstances, the later conditional release does no further damage to the prior creditor and actually can be advantageous to the creditor. For example, in a case such as this where the vehicle is necessary to the owner's business, the conditional release allows the owner to generate cash to pay off the mechanic's lien and make payments on the creditor's prior loan. If the mechanic were forced to keep possession of the vehicle, the owner would be unable to raise the cash to pay off either the mechanic or the creditor.

The circumstance where a prior creditor could be damaged by the conditional release also is covered by the Restatement. If a prior creditor does not have notice of the mechanic's lien and goes through the expense of levying upon the vehicle while it is in the owner's possession, then the levying creditor is accorded the same protection as the bona fide purchaser for value or the new attaching creditor. This rule gives the prior creditor a "window of opportunity" to levy, but the mechanic can protect the lien by notifying prior creditors of the conditional release arrangement.

For the reasons stated above, we reject the bank's argument that a conditional release of the vehicle destroys the lien as to all third parties. Instead, we adopt the Restatement's rule that upon a conditional release, the lien is enforceable against all parties except a bona fide purchaser for value or a subsequent attaching or levying creditor who has no notice of the mechanic's interest. Upon the resumption of possession, the lien is revived and retains its priority as before the release, except it is subordinate to the bona fide purchaser or attaching or levying creditor. Applying this rule to the facts of the case, it is apparent that the mechanic's lien is superior to the bank's security interest. The fact that the truck was found at the mechanic's place of business well after the repairs were made supports Treleven's claim that the release of the vehicle was conditional. Furthermore, the bank is not afforded the protection given to the levying creditor because the sheriff levied upon the vehicle while it was in Treleven's possession, and thus had notice of Treleven's interest.

Because Treleven's lien was not waived by the conditional release under sec. 779.41(1), Stats., we next must examine whether the conditional release destroyed the lien's priority under sec. 409.310, Stats. Neither party addressed this issue, but commentary and cases interpreting Uniform Commercial Code § 9-310, the model upon which sec. 409.310 is based, make clear that the possession requirement of this statute is separate from any possession requirement of the underlying mechanic's lien.

U.C.C. § 9-310 gives priority only to the mechanic in possession of the vehicle. It is uniformly held that if the mechanic voluntarily gives up possession of the vehicle, § 9-310 cannot be relied upon by the mechanic to give his lien priority over the prior secured interest. *See United States v. Crittenden*, 563 F.2d 678, 691 (5th Cir. 1977), *vacated and remanded*, 440 U.S. 715 (1979); *In re Glenn*, 20 B.R. 98, 99 (Bankr. E.D. Tenn. 1982); *Forrest Cate Ford, Inc. v. Fryar*, 465 S.W.2d 882, 884 (Tenn. Ct. App. 1970).

The question then becomes whether the resumption of possession will allow sec. 409.310, Stats., to be applied to give the mechanic's lien priority. The statute's language does not tell us whether continuous possession is required. When a statute is ambiguous we must look to other sources to determine legislative intent. Among the few courts that have decided this issue, the jurisdictions do not agree as to the effect of resuming possession under § 9-310. The three cases discussing this issue the most thoroughly are *Glenn*, *Crittenden* and *Thorp Commercial Corp. v. Mississippi Road Supply Co.*, 348 So. 2d 1016 (Miss. 1977).

The opinion of the Mississippi Supreme Court in *Thorp* held that the mechanic retained priority under the Mississippi equivalent to § 9-310 when he resumed possession of equipment. The court reasoned that the status or rights of the parties did not change between the date the mechanic lost possession of the equipment and the date it was restored to the possession of the mechanic. Furthermore, the court recognized that the secured party was not and could not be prejudiced by the restoration. Finally, the court concluded that because the Mississippi equivalent of § 9-310 did not clearly express an intention to reverse long-established principles of law, § 9-310 had to be read together with the older mechanic's lien statute and prior case law which established that mechanic's liens take priority over prior security interests. These justifications supported the court's opinion that priority status of the mechanic's lien was retained under § 9-310 when the mechanic regained possession.

Glenn and the dissenting opinion in *Thorp* stated that the priority of the mechanic's lien is lost under statutes based on § 9-310 when there is a lapse in the mechanic's possession. *Glenn* reasoned that a rule which allowed the reinstatement of priority "would create an ever-present dangerous uncertainty for parties, including prior secured parties, who deal with the debtor with respect to goods in his possession" because the prior secured party would have no notice of the mechanic's lien. *Glenn*, 20 B.R. at 99. Glenn also based its conclusion on the same concerns of the dissent in *Thorp*—a rule reinstating priority under the statute would permit the priority of the creditors to be determined by the debtor.

> If he chooses to return property once relinquished by a repairman, the repairman prevails, but if he chooses not to relinquish possession of the property the secured creditor prevails . . . . [A rule reinstating priority under the statute] invites competition

> for possession between a secured party and a repairman who has previously relinquished possession of the property.

Id. at 100–01.

The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals held that a mechanic retained his priority over a prior security interest only to the extent that the mechanic continuously possessed the collateral. *Crittenden*, 563 F.2d at 691. The court analogized § 9-310 to 26 U.S.C. § 6323(b)(5), a provision of the Federal Tax Lien Act, which gives priority to the mechanic's lien only if the mechanic "is, and has been, continuously in possession of such property from the time such lien arose." 26 U.S.C. § 6323(b)(5). The court justified the continuous possession requirement by reasoning that while considerations of equity and fairness created the mechanic's lien exception to the normal priority rules, at some point when the mechanic gives up possession and the repairs were made in the more distant past the mechanic's interest becomes indistinguishable from the ordinary creditor.

In light of the longstanding Wisconsin policy of protecting materialmen and laborers, we find the Mississippi court's opinion in *Thorp* to be the most persuasive. The bank has not presented any facts which would show how its rights were affected or its interest was prejudiced by the release of the property to Wilson and Treleven's subsequent repossession. If anything, the facts show that the bank was better off through the conditional release because it afforded Wilson the resources to pay off both debts.

Like Mississippi's law in *Thorp*, Wisconsin case law decided prior to the enactment of sec. 409.310, Stats., gave priority to a mechanic's lien over a prior security interest. *See Jesse A. Smith Auto Co. v. Kaestner*, 159 N.W. 738 (Wisc. 1916). Wisconsin's enactment of sec. 409.310 did not expressly state that its effect was to displace prior law in this area. Commentary to the Uniform Commercial Code reveals the drafter's view that § 9-310 was to reverse prior case law which subordinated the mechanic's lien to prior security interests, but it does not state how the rule was to affect prior decisions holding the mechanic's lien superior. See U.C.C. § 9-310 comment 2. Because Wisconsin's prior case law and sec. 409.310 can be read in a consistent manner, we decline to interpret the statute otherwise.

Finally, but not least importantly, the plain language of sec. 409.310, Stats., gives priority to the mechanic "in possession." It does not require "continuous possession" or "retained possession." We must construe laws relating to mechanic's liens in a way to accomplish their equitable purpose of aiding mechanics in obtaining compensation.

The Fifth Circuit's opinion in *Crittenden* which read the continuous possession requirement into § 9-310 is not persuasive. In *Crittenden*, the Fifth Circuit was interested in formulating a federal standard to determine priorities under the Uniform Commercial Code. Thus, it looked to the Federal Tax Lien Act for guidance in its interpretation of the "possession" requirement of § 9-310. *Crittenden*, 563 F.2d at 691. On appeal the Supreme Court reversed, stating that the court should not be looking to federal standards to determine priorities, but should apply Georgia's statutes. *United States v. Kimbell Foods*, 440 U.S. 715, 740 (1979). On remand, the Fifth Circuit held that Georgia's priority statute was basically the same as model § 9-310 and, without discussion, applied the same interpretation of the statute to the facts in the case. *United States v. Crittenden*, 600 F.2d 478, 479–80 (5th Cir. 1979). Unlike the Fifth Circuit's first *Crittenden* opinion, we are not concerned with formulating a national standard and do not need to look at other federal laws interpreting "possession;" under Wisconsin law, we must interpret sec. 409.310, Stats., in a way that aids the mechanic in obtaining compensation. It is not in a mechanic's best interest to interpret "possession" in sec. 409.310 as "continuous possession," and we decline to do so. Therefore, because Treleven was in possession of the vehicle at the time the bank's lien was enforced, Treleven's mechanic's lien had priority over the bank's interest under sec. 409.310.

Notes and Questions

1.7. *In re Housecraft Industries*, 155 B.R. 79, 86–87 (Bankr. D. Vt. 1993) gives some background on the evolution of security interests in personal property:

> Until the early nineteenth century, the only way to create a valid interest in personal property was by physical pledge—the transfer of possession of the property (collateral) by a debtor (the pledgor) to the creditor or secured party (the pledgee). Possession provided public notice of a secured party's interest in collateral and prevented debtors from selling their pledged property to innocent purchasers or from obtaining credit based on encumbered assets. To further protect third parties against undisclosed interests in property, the common law presumed

> that nonpossessory interests were fraudulent and therefore unenforceable against third parties. *Twyne's Case*, 76 Eng. Rep. 809 (Star Chamber 1601).
>
> The increasing demands of the credit economy eventually created a need for collateral that remained in a debtor's possession. Limited only by their creativity, debtors, creditors, and their counsel formulated methods of perfection that provided both possession to debtors and security to creditors. The resulting rules varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, producing what one commentator has called a "labyrinthine melange" of personal property securities laws. Throughout this development toward modern commercial law, the common law pledge existed side by side with other forms of perfecting security interests in personal property.
>
> The Uniform Commercial Code . . . streamlined commercial law and preserved the pledge to complement a public filing system. Article 9 of the UCC, . . . governs security interests in most forms of personal property and fixtures. Article 9 recognizes three general ways to perfect a security interest: filing (public registration); possession of the collateral, either directly, constructively or through an agent; and third party notice, including notice given by the secured party to another holding the collateral.

1.8. Treleven, the mechanic, wins in *Wilson*. But why? Critique the following summaries of the holding:

- "Mechanics in possession have priority over other creditors."
- "Trevelen's lien arose before the bank's."
- "Trevelen put the bank on notice of his lien."

Each of these statements is misleading standing alone, but the holding draws on them all. What *is* the rule of the case?

1.9. Suppose Groucho takes his car to Harpo's Transmissions for repairs and parks it on Harpo's lot. That's a bailment; Harpo must turn over the car when Groucho demands it back. But now suppose that Harpo does $400 worth of repairs on the car at Groucho's request and Groucho fails to pay. Harpo now has a mechanic's lien on the car. Can Groucho get his car back? What remedies could Harpo obtain if he sued Groucho for breach of contract? Does having the car on his lot give him any additional options? What if Groucho sells the car to Chico without telling Chico about Harpo's lien? What if Harpo lets Groucho drive the car off the lot to confirm that the transmission has been fixed and Groucho floors it as soon as he reaches the highway and never comes back? If Harpo finds the car in Groucho's driveway, can he tow it back to his lot?

1.10. What are Groucho and Harpo's respective rights and obligations if Zeppo steals the car while it's parked on Harpo's lot? If the police subsequently find the car abandoned on the side of the road, who is entitled to it? Conversely, if Zeppo totals the car by driving it into a tree and both Groucho and Harpo sue him for conversion, what result?

1.11. *Wilson* gives a glimpse at the perennial problem of *priority*, which arises whenever a debtor has multiple creditors and is unable to pay them all. The ultimate system for sorting out priority is federal bankruptcy law, but as *Wilson* illustrates, state commercial law (especially Article 9 of the UCC) plays a significant role too. Even a quick skim through Article 9 shows how extensively its rules are adapted to the particular characteristics of the class of property at issue (or perhaps, to the demands of special-interest lobbying and the successive encrustations of history). *See, e.g.*, UCC § 9-102, which distinguishes accounts; farm products; oil, gas, and minerals both in and out of the ground; tort claims; commodity futures; consumer goods; health-care debts; manufactured homes; software; and much, much, more.

1.12. Many states attempt to solve the core problem in *Wilson* by requiring that car liens be recorded with the state Department of Motor Vehicles and indicated on car owners' certificates of title. The Maryland system, for example, provides that a security interest in a vehicle is "perfected" by "Delivery to the [Motor Vehicle] Administration of every existing certificate of title of the vehicle and an application for certificate of title [including the necessary information about the security interest]" and that a security interest that has not been so perfected "is not valid against any creditor of the owner or any subsequent transferee or secured party." MD. CODE TRANSP. § 13.202. The theory is that the buyer or lender can protect itself by demanding to see the title certificate—indeed, a buyer will need to turn in the old title certificate to register the car and a lender will need to turn it in to record its own security interest. Is this system fair to senior lenders? Fair to buyers and junior lenders? How might the system go wrong? How might a fraudster make it go wrong? All things considered, is this a better system than the Wisconsin one discussed in *Wilson*?

1.2 Real Estate Mortgages

A mortgage is an interest in land. It is not a possessory interest: the owner of a mortgage has no right to use the property, the way the owner of the fee or an easement owner would. Instead, mortgages exist to secure loans. A secured loan is backed, or secured, by a specific asset such as a house or a car, which the lender can seize in case of default. An unsecured loan is not secured by any specific asset—for example, credit card debt and student loans are unsecured. The borrower owes the money, and the lender can go after the borrower's unsecured assets in case of default, but if those assets are too small, the unsecured lender is out of luck. Secured loans are generally considered less risky than unsecured loans, for obvious reasons, and should bear lower interest rates (absent some foolery on the part of the lender or government intervention into the market, both of which do happen).

Most mortgages are residential mortgages. Usually, homebuyers in the United States can't afford to pay the entire purchase price of a house at the time they buy it. Instead, they take out a loan—a mortgage—to pay the bulk of the purchase price. They will sign a promissory note (the note) that creates personal liability for the borrowers if they fail to pay, and also sets out the terms of the mortgage such as the repayment period and the interest rate. They will also sign a mortgage, a written instrument that grants the lender an interest in their newly purchased land. Usually, this transaction occurs at the time the buyers buy the land, though mortgages can also be refinanced or taken out on already-owned property.

The homebuyers are the *mortgagors*. The lender is the *mortgagee*. Over time, the buyers pay off the loan. As they pay off the loan, they build "equity" in their homes. Equity is the difference between what a home is worth and what the homeowners owe on their mortgage.[2] As a result of deliberate policy choices, the model residential mortgage in the United States is for no more than 80% of the value of the house at time of purchase; has a fixed interest rate; and amortizes over a period of years, usually twenty or thirty. Amortization means that the payments are the same throughout the period of the mortgage: at the beginning, most of the payments go to interest on the loan, while over time more and more of the payments go to reduce the loan principal.

The mortgagors can transfer the land at will. However, any transfer will not free

[2]This terminology has a historical basis in the "equity of redemption," which was a means by which early chancellors protected early mortgagors from abuses by lenders. Over time, the equitable procedures created by courts gave way to legislation establishing rules for how foreclosures could occur.

the land from the mortgage (nor will a transfer free them from their contractual promise to pay the debt); the mortgage *runs with the land*. Thus, a sensible transferee will not be willing to pay full value for the land—the fair market value of the land is reduced by the amount of the mortgage. A transferee can either take "subject to the mortgage," which means that the original mortgagors still owe the debt and the transferee is at risk if they don't pay, or "assuming the mortgage," which means that the new owner agrees to pay the mortgage directly. When the purchaser assumes the mortgage, the seller still has a duty to pay the mortgage if the buyer doesn't, but the seller can pursue the buyer for reimbursement if that happens. However, this all risks some big messes; to avoid problems associated with transfers, many mortgages have "due on sale" clauses, which means that the full amount of the mortgage comes due ("accelerates") when the mortgagor sells the property. One important feature of a due on sale clause is that it enables lenders to reprice loans: if the interest rate has risen since the initial mortgage loan, the buyer can't just assume the existing loan and receive a lower interest rate than would otherwise be available to him.

Suppose Joan Watson wants to sell her house to Sherlock Holmes. She still owes $400,000 on her house; Holmes will be buying it for $500,000. But she doesn't have $400,000 in the bank to pay off her mortgage, which has a due on sale clause. How can she accomplish the sale? The answer is that a series of transactions take place together. The day of the sale, Holmes will give Watson a check for $500,000 (most of which will likely come from Holmes' own new mortgage on the property). Watson will then pay her lender $400,000 and keep $100,000. As you can see, there will be some time at which both Holmes and Watson are relying on the value of the underlying property—Holmes to get his mortgage and Watson to pay hers off. For this reason, real estate transactions regularly involve the use of multiple third parties, including escrow agents, to facilitate and guarantee the sale.

If the mortgagors default on the mortgage by failing to pay the appropriate amounts at the appropriate times, the mortgagee can foreclose. Foreclosure can be time-consuming and expensive, so in some circumstances the mortgagee may accept a "deed in lieu of foreclosure," by which the mortgagor surrenders the property to the mortgagee and the mortgagee accepts the deed. However, deeds in lieu of foreclosure are relatively rare; most of the time, if a default is not cured and the loan is not modified, the result will be a foreclosure.

Either by a private sale (nonjudicial foreclosure) or under judicial supervision (judicial foreclosure), the mortgagee can have the property sold and apply the proceeds of the sale to the amount due on the note. The foreclosure is so called because it forecloses the mortgagee's ability to get the property back by paying off the mortgage debt; after the foreclosure, it is too late to become current.[3]

In a number of states, it is possible to avoid judicial foreclosure—which takes more time and money than nonjudicial foreclosure—through the use of a "deed of trust," which is recognized in most jurisdictions. Under a deed of trust, the borrower conveys title to the property to a person to hold in trust to secure the debt. If the borrower defaults, the trustee has the power of sale without needing to go to court. However, almost all states that allow this procedure do impose some procedural safeguards, such as notice and public sale. Other than the ability to avoid judicial foreclosure, you can expect a deed of trust to be treated like a mortgage.

In addition, there are two different types of secured loans: recourse and nonrecourse loans. For a nonrecourse loan, the only way the lender can get its money back in case of default is by seizing the asset, and if there's not enough money to satisfy the debt from the asset, too bad for the lender. The lender has no "recourse" against any of the borrower's other assets. A recourse loan is different: in case of default, the lender can seize and sell the asset, and if there's not enough money to satisfy the debt, the lender is now an unsecured creditor for the remaining balance (the deficiency) and can go after any of the borrower's other assets, such as her bank account. Foreclosure wipes out the lender's interest in the land, which means that the land can then be resold free of the lender's interest. However, with a recourse loan, foreclosure will not wipe out the borrower's debt, if it is greater than the foreclosure sale amount.

Obviously, lenders ordinarily prefer recourse loans, but will grant nonrecourse loans in various circumstances.[4] Many businesses can get nonrecourse loans based on their assets. Some states bar deficiency judgments for residential mortgages, which makes them nonrecourse loans. Other states bar deficiency judgments unless there is a judicial foreclosure, with its greater expense and greater procedural protections for the borrower. Still others limit the amount of any deficiency judg-

[3] At common law, the equity of redemption allowed the mortgagor to redeem the property from the mortgagee. This equity of redemption was extinguished by foreclosure sale. In about half of the states, there is also a statutory right to redeem the property from the *purchaser* at a foreclosure sale for a certain period of time. This right is rarely used, because most people would already have paid, if they could, before the sale.

[4] In fact, the basic idea of a corporation is a way of limiting a lender's recourse: before the corporate form, if a business owner went bust, creditors could go after the owner's personal assets until they were gone. The corporation allows shareholders/owners to limit their liability to the extent of the corporation's assets. If a person owned shares of Lehman Brothers, its creditors could make her shares worthless, but they couldn't make her pay Lehman Brothers' debts.

ment to the difference between the principal balance and the property's fair market value at the time of foreclosure—this limit recognizes that foreclosed properties often sell for below market value for a variety of reasons, including buyers' uncertainty about the true condition of the property and the limited number of potential buyers who bid at foreclosure sales. (Historically, the mortgagee is often the only bidder at a foreclosure sale. Why would this be true?)

Even states that allow deficiency judgments generally recognize an exception: if the sale price shocks the conscience, then a deficiency judgment may not be allowed. More generally, even in the absence of a potential deficiency judgment, the foreclosing entity has a limited duty of good faith to the mortgagor in seeking an acceptable price at the sale. However, mere inadequacy of price will not invalidate a sale in the absence of fraud, unfairness, or procedural problems that deterred bidding. As a result, very low sale prices are sometimes accepted by courts. *Compare Moeller v. Lien*, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 777 (Ct. App. 1994) (sale at 25% of market value was acceptable where sale was to bona fide purchaser and there was no irregularity in the sale procedure), *with Murphy v. Fin. Dev. Corp.*, 495 A.2d 1245 (N.H. 1985) (finding that mortgagee violated duty to mortgagor when (1) sale was rescheduled and poorly advertised, (2) sale price was so low that it wiped out substantial equity for homeowners, and (3) mortgagee quickly resold property at substantially higher price).

One final introductory point: it is possible to take out a second and even a third mortgage. The first mortgage has "priority" over the second mortgage: it will be paid first at foreclosure. Only if there is money remaining after the first mortgage is paid off will the holder of the second mortgage be paid. As a result of the greater risk involved in second mortgages, they generally bear higher interest rates than first mortgages.

Notes and Questions

1.13. As an initial matter, pay attention to the property interests involved. First, there is the promissory note itself, which gives the loan originator (the bank) has the right to receive monthly payments. But the note is typically alienable—the originator can sell it to another bank, or a loan servicer, or a financial institution. In that sense, the note itself is a kind of property right.

1.14. Second, there are the property interests relating to the real property. The mortgagor has a sort of possessory estate, insofar as the mortgagor gets to live on the mortgaged land. The mortgagee has a kind of future interest.

What events cause a change to the property interests of the mortgagor and mortgagee by operation of law? (There are several.) What happens after each, and what are the resulting property interests? If you can answer these questions, then you have grasped the basic operation of mortgages.

1.15. The original *Open Source Property* module on mortgages provides a more detailed explanation of the 2007–2010 mortgage and foreclosure crisis in the United States. But this overview of how mortgages work is enough to provide the seeds for understanding what happened. Consider the following.

1.16. Foreclosure sales are supposed to recover the fair market value of the mortgaged land, which ought to be enough to repay the mortgagor's debt and also return additional equity that the mortgagor has built up through payments. These sales are usually conducted by an auction. Do you believe that these auctions actually recover the fair market value? Who shows up to these auctions?

1.17. When a bank offers a mortgage to a homebuyer, presumably the bank hopes that the homebuyer will pay off the mortgage and not default. Foreclosure is a costly, messy process. That's why credit ratings and background checks are so important for getting mortgages. What might lead a bank to be willing to offer a mortgage to a homebuyer who is at higher risk of default—a "subprime mortgage"? Perhaps if housing prices are rising faster than expected, as they were between 2001 and 2006?

1.18. A real estate mortgage is a useful security interest against a mortgage debt because the real estate is presumably more valuable than the debt. (That's also why a down payment around 20% is required.) What happens if housing prices fall so much that the real estate is worth less than the debt? This is called an "underwater mortgage." What are the incentives of the mortgagor and the mortgagee?

1.19. If mortgages are property that can be bought and sold, they can be turned into investment vehicles. This process (described in detail in Adam J. Levitin, *The Paper Chase: Securitization, Foreclosure, and the Uncertainty of Mortgage Title*, 63 DUKE L.J. 637 (2013)) is called "securitization." In the same way that stocks for multiple companies can be bundled together to make a mutual fund, where one can buy shares and receive a cut of all the companies' dividends, multiple mortgages can be bundled together in a "mortgage-backed security," where shareholders in the security are entitled to a cut of the profits (i.e., the interest payments) from the foreclosures. Typically, the mortgages themselves are held by a legal entity such as a trust, which pays out the interest payments as the trust proceeds.

Who might buy these mortgage-backed securities? Investment bankers? Pension and retirement funds? You? And what happens to these investments when the mortgages go sour, for any of the reasons given above?

1.20. As we have seen, the current possessory estate holder can owe duties to future interest holders, under the doctrine of waste. What about the other way around—can a future interest holder owe a duty to the possessory estate holder? Consider the problem of mortgage servicing, described below.

1.3 Foreclosure Abuses

One ongoing problem is that the complicated structure of post-securitization mortgage lending left responsibility for problems diffuse, and even put incentives in precisely the wrong places. Because the trusts that own the mortgages and package them into mortgage-backed securities are passive legal vehicles with no employees or activities of their own, they contracted with mortgage servicers, often divisions of the same banks that initially sponsored the mortgage originators. The basic job is straightforward: servicers collect payments from homeowners and pass them along to the trust that represents the investors. Servicers are also responsible for handling foreclosures. In exchange, servicers typically get a small percentage of the value of the outstanding loans each year in fees. For a \$200,000 loan to a borrower with good credit, a servicer might collect about \$50 per month, with income decreasing as the balance of the loan drops. Servicers also make money from the "float"—interest earned during the short time the servicer holds the loan payment.

It is standard for servicers to be contractually required to keep paying the trust every month, even when there's a default, until there's a foreclosure. This would seem a strong incentive to do everything possible to help homeowners avoid a default, which is usually what investors want. The holder of a mortgage loses an average \$60,000 on a foreclosure, according to figures announced by the federal government.

But the systems weren't set up that way. Among other things, servicers hired very few people with the ability to work with borrowers to find an affordable repayment; they were largely set up to take in money and pass it on. When the crisis hit, they were overwhelmed with troubled loans. Further, at the beginning of the foreclosure crisis, servicers often took the position that they were contractually prohibited from negotiating with borrowers by their agreements with the trusts, which allegedly did not allow them to reduce mortgagors' nominal obligations without the consent of the trust. (Recall that the trusts are not functioning companies with humans making day-to-day decisions, so the servicers' position meant that *no one* could agree to a renegotiation.)

Separately, servicers had incentives that conflicted with borrowers' and investors' interests. Servicers can charge fees for late payments, title searches, property upkeep, inspections, appraisals and legal fees that can total hundreds of dollars each month and can all be charged against a homeowner's account. Servicers have first dibs on recouping those fees when a foreclosed home is sold, meaning they usually collect unless the home is essentially worthless. Moreover, when homeowners tried to catch up or make partial payments as they sought a renegotiated loan, servicers applied their payments first to the servicers' own fees rather than to the underlying loan. These fees can be lucrative. In 2010, major servicer Ocwen reported $32.8 million in revenue from late fees alone, representing 9 percent of its total revenue. Professor Levitin, who has done extensive work on the legal and business structures resulting from securitization, concluded that a loan kept in default for a year or two could prove more profitable to a servicer than a typical healthy, performing loan.

The following case involves a trustee rather than a typical servicer, but otherwise it provides a sense of the problems that can arise when participants in the mortgage transaction are indifferent to the welfare of mortgagors.

Klem v. Washington Mutual Bank

176 Wash. 2d 771, 295 P.3d 1179 (Wash. 2013)

CHAMBERS, J.

Dorothy Halstien, an aging woman suffering from dementia, owned a home worth somewhere between $235,000 and $320,000. At about the time she developed dementia, she owed approximately $75,000 to Washington Mutual Bank (WaMu), secured by a deed of trust* on her home. Because of the cost of her care, her guardian did not have the funds to pay her mortgage, and Quality Loan Services (Quality), acting as the trustee of the deed of trust, foreclosed on her home. On the first day it could, Quality sold her home for $83,087.67, one dollar more than she owed, including fees and costs. A notary, employed by Quality, had falsely notarized the notice of sale by predating the notary acknowledgment. This falsification permitted the sale to take place earlier than it could have had the notice of sale been dated when it was actually signed.

Before the foreclosure sale, Halstien's court appointed guardian se-

*"Deed of trust" is defined in section I of the Analysis section below; it is a kind of mortgage. —Eds.

cured a signed purchase and sale agreement from a buyer willing to pay $235,000 for the house. Unfortunately, there was not enough time before the scheduled foreclosure sale to close the sale with that buyer. In Washington, the trustee has the discretion to postpone foreclosure sales. This trustee declined to consider exercising that discretion, and instead deferred the decision to the lender, WaMu. Despite numerous requests by the guardian, WaMu did not postpone the sale. A jury found that the trustee was negligent; that the trustee's acts or practices violated the Consumer Protection Act (CPA), chapter 19.86 RCW; and that the trustee breached its contractual obligations. The Court of Appeals reversed all but the negligence claim. We reverse the Court of Appeals in part and restore the award based upon the CPA. We award the guardian reasonable attorney fees and remand to the trial court to order appropriate injunctive relief.

Facts

The issues presented require a detailed discussion of the facts. In 1996, Halstien bought a house on Whidbey Island for $147,500. In 2004, she borrowed $73,000 from WaMu, secured by a deed of trust on her home. That loan was the only debt secured by the property, which otherwise Halstien owned free and clear. Unfortunately, by 2006, when Halstien was 74 years old, she developed dementia. At the time, Halstien's daughter and her daughter's boyfriend were living at the home with her.

Washington State's Adult Protective Services became concerned that Halstien was a vulnerable adult being neglected at home. After an investigation, protective services petitioned the court for the appointment of a professional guardian to protect Halstien. The court granted the petition and Dianne Klem, executive director of Puget Sound Guardians, was appointed Halstien's guardian in January 2007. Klem soon placed Halstien in the dementia unit of a skilled nursing facility in Snohomish County.

Halstien's care cost between $3,000 and $6,000 a month. At the time, Halstien received about $1,444 a month in income from Social Security and a Teamsters' pension. The State of Washington paid the balance of her care and is a creditor of her estate.

Halstien's only significant asset was her Whidbey Island home, which at the time was assessed by the county at $257,804. WaMu also had an appraisal indicating the home was worth $320,000, nearly four times the value of the outstanding debt. Klem testified that if she had been able to sell the home, she could have improved Halstien's quality of life considerably by providing additional services the State did not pay for.

Selling the home was neither quick nor easy. Even after Halstien was placed in a skilled care facility, her daughter still lived in the home (without paying rent) and both the daughter and her brother strongly opposed any sale. The record suggests Halstien's children expected to inherit the home and, Klem testified, getting the daughter and her family to leave "was quite a battle." Ultimately, Puget Sound Guardians prevailed, but before it could sell the home, it had to obtain court permission (complicated, apparently, by the considerable notice that had to be given to various state agencies and to family members, and because some of those entitled to notice were difficult to find), remove abandoned animals and vehicles, and clean up the property.

During this process Halstien became delinquent on her mortgage. Quality, identifying itself as "the agent for Washington Mutual," posted a notice of default on Halstien's home on or around October 25, 2007. The notice demanded $1,372.20 to bring the note current. The record establishes that the guardianship did not have available funds to satisfy the demand.

A notice of trustee sale was executed shortly afterward by Seth Ott for Quality. The notice was dated and, according to the notary jurat of "R. Tassle," notarized on November 26, 2007. However, the notice of sale was not actually signed that day. The sale was set for February 29, 2008.

This notice of sale was one of apparently many foreclosure documents that were falsely notarized by Quality and its employees around that time. There was considerable evidence that falsifying notarizations was a common practice, and one that Quality employees had been trained to do. While Quality employees steadfastly refused to speculate under oath how or why this practice existed, the evidence suggests that documents were falsely dated and notarized to expedite foreclosures and thereby keep their clients, the lenders, beneficiaries, and other participants in the secondary market for mortgage debt happy with their work. Ott acknowledged on the stand that if the notice of sale had been correctly dated, the sale would not have taken place until at least one week later.

On January 10, 2008, Puget Sound Guardians asset manager David Greenfield called Ott in his capacity as trustee. Greenfield explained that Halstien was in a guardianship and that the guardianship intended to sell the property. Greenfield initially understood, incorrectly, that the trustee would postpone the sale if Puget Sound Guardians presented WaMu with a signed purchase and sale agreement by February 19, 2008. Puget Sound Guardians sought, and on January 31, 2008, received, court permission to hire a real estate agent to help sell the house.

Unknown to Greenfield, Quality, as trustee, had an agreement with WaMu that it would not delay a trustee's sale except upon WaMu's express direction. This agreement was articulated in a confidential "attorney expectation document" that was given to the jury. This confidential document outlines how foreclosures were to be done and billed. It specifically states, "Your office is not authorized to postpone a sale without authorization from Fidelity or Washington Mutual." This agreement is, at least, in tension with Quality's fiduciary duty to both sides and its duty to act impartially. Cox v. Helenius, 103 Wash.2d 383, 389, 693 P.2d 683 (1985) (citing George E. Osborne, Grant S. Nelson & Dale A. Whitman, Real Estate Finance Law § 7.21 (1979) ("[A] trustee of a deed of trust is a fiduciary for both the mortgagee and mortgagor and must act impartially between them.")).[1]

Regardless of what Washington law expected or required of trustees, David Owen, Quality's chief operations officer in San Diego, testified that Quality did what WaMu told it to do during foreclosures. Owen testified that there were two situations where Quality would postpone a sale without bank permission: if there was a bankruptcy or if the debt had been paid. Owen could not remember any time Quality had postponed a sale without the bank's permission.

By February 19, 2008, Puget Sound Guardians had a signed purchase and sale agreement, with the closing date set for on or about March 28, 2008. This was almost a month after the scheduled foreclosure sale, but well within the 120 day window a trustee has to hold the trustee's sale under RCW 61.24.040(6). Quality referred the guardians to the bank "to find out the process for making this happen." Klem testified Quality "told us on two occasions that they unequivocally could not assist us in that area, that only the bank could make the decision."

Puget Sound Guardians contacted WaMu, which instructed them to send copies of the guardianship documents and a completed purchase and

[1]Since then, the legislature has amended the deed of trust act to provide that the trustee owes a duty of good faith to both sides. Laws of 2008, ch. 153, § 1; RCW 61.24.010(4) (effective June 12, 2008).

sale agreement. Over the next few days, WaMu instructed the guardians to send the same documents to WaMu offices in Seattle, Washington, southern California, and Miami, Florida. Klem testified that Puget Sound Guardians called WaMu on "[m]any occasions," and that if the bank ever made a decision, it did not share what it was. The guardian also faxed a copy of the purchase and sale agreement to various WaMu offices on February 19, 21, 26, 27, and 28. In all, the guardian contacted Quality or WaMu over 20 times in the effort to get the sale postponed. Simply put, Quality deferred to WaMu and WaMu was unresponsive.

Accordingly, the trustee's sale was not delayed and took place on February 29, 2008. Quality, as trustee, sold the Halstien home to Randy and Gail Preston for $83,087.67, one dollar more than the amounts outstanding on the loan, plus fees and costs.[4] The Prestons resold the house for $235,000 shortly afterward.

Klem later testified it was "shocking when we found out that [the home] had actually been sold for $83,000 . . . . Because we trusted that they would sell it for the value of the home." In previous cases where a ward's home had gone into foreclosure, Klem testified, either the trustee had postponed the sale to allow Puget Sound Guardians to sell the property or had sold the property for a reasonable price. Klem testified that if they had just one more week, it was "very possible" that they could have closed the sale earlier.

In April 2008, represented by the Northwest Justice Project, Puget Sound Guardians sued Quality for damages on a variety of theories, including negligence, breach of contract, and violation of the CPA. Later, with permission of the court, Quality's California sister corporation was added as a defendant. Halstien died that December.

Quality defended itself vigorously on a variety of theories. Initially successfully, Quality argued that any cause of action based on the trustee's duties was barred by the fact Klem had not sought an injunction to enjoin the sale. The record suggests that it would have been impossible for the guardianship to get a presale injunction due to the time frame, the need for court approval, and the lack of assets in the guardianship estate. While Judge Monica Benton dismissed some claims based on the failure of the estate to seek an injunction, she specifically found that the negligence, breach of contract, and CPA claims could go forward.

[4]As of trial, Quality had not delivered that one dollar to the Halstien estate.

The case proceeded to a jury trial. The heart of the plaintiff's case was the theory that Quality's acts and practices of deferring to the lender and falsifying dates on notarized documents were unfair and deceptive and that the trustee was negligent in failing to delay the sale. David Leen, an expert on Washington's deed of trust act, chapter 61.24 RCW, testified that it was common for trustees to postpone the sale to allow the debtors to pay off the default. He testified that under the facts of this case, the trustee "would absolutely have to continue the sale."

By contrast, Ott, representing Quality as trustee in this case, testified that he did not take into account whether the house was worth more than the debt when conducting foreclosures. When asked why, Ott responded, "My job was to process the foreclosure . . . according to the state statutes." When pressed, Ott explained that he counted the days, prepared the forms, saw they were filed, and nothing more. He acknowledged that, prior to 2009, he would sometimes incorrectly date documents. He testified that he had been trained to do that. He also testified that Quality, as trustee, would not delay trustee sales without the lender's permission. And he testified that he had never actually read Washington's deed of trust statutes.[5]

The jury found for the plaintiff on three claims: negligence, CPA, and breach of contract. . . . The jury determined that the damages on all three claims were the same: $151,912.33 (the difference between the foreclosure sale price and $235,000) . . . .

Quality brought a blunderbuss of challenges to the trial court's decisions. . . . The Court of Appeals concluded . . . that the evidence was insufficient to uphold the breach of contract and CPA claims. . . .

Analysis

. . . .

I. CPA Claims

To prevail on a CPA action, the plaintiff must prove an "(1) unfair or deceptive act or practice; (2) occurring in trade or commerce; (3) public interest impact; (4) injury to plaintiff in his or her business or property; (5) causation." *Hangman Ridge Training Stables, Inc. v. Safeco Title Ins. Co.*,

---

[5]This inspired a juror's question, "If you never read the statute, how did you know you were following it, following Washington law?" Ott responded that he relied on his training. . . .

105 Wash.2d 778, 780, 719 P.2d 531 (1986). The plaintiff argues that both Quality's historical practice of predating notarized foreclosure documents and Quality's practice of deferring to the lender on whether to postpone most sales, satisfies the first element of the CPA. Deciding whether the first element is satisfied requires us to examine the role of the trustee in nonjudicial foreclosure actions. A deed of trust is a form of a mortgage, an age-old mechanism for securing a loan. 18 William B. Stoebuck & John W. Weaver, *Washington Practice: Real Estate: Transactions* § 17.1, at 253, § 20.1, at 403 (2d ed. 2004). In Washington, it is a statutorily blessed "three-party transaction in which land is conveyed by a borrower, the 'grantor,' to a 'trustee,' who holds title in trust for a lender, the 'beneficiary,' as security for credit or a loan the lender has given the borrower." If the deed of trust contains the power of sale, the trustee may usually foreclose the deed of trust and sell the property without judicial supervision. *Id.* at 260–61; RCW 61.24.020; RCW 61.12. 090; RCW 7.28.230(1) . . . .

A. Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices

The legislature has specifically stated that certain violations of the deed of trust act are unfair or deceptive acts or practices for purposes of the CPA. [The Supreme Court found that this list was not exclusive; other violations could be unfair or deceptive as determined by a common-law, evolutionary process: " 'It is impossible to frame definitions which embrace all unfair practices. There is no limit to human inventiveness in this field. Even if all known unfair practices were specifically defined and prohibited, it would be at once necessary to begin over again' " (citation omitted).] . . .

B. Failure To Exercise Independent Discretion To Postpone Sale

Until the 1965 deed of trust act, there was no provision in Washington law for a nonjudicial foreclosure. In 1965, the legislature authorized nonjudicial foreclosure for the first time, subject to strict statutory requirements. Because of the very nature of nonjudicial foreclosures, Washington courts have not shied away from protecting the rights of the parties. . . .

The power to sell another person's property, often the family home itself, is a tremendous power to vest in anyone's hands. Our legislature has allowed that power to be placed in the hands of a private trustee, rather than a state officer, but common law and equity requires that trustee to be evenhanded to both sides and to strictly follow the law. This court has frequently emphasized that the deed of trust act "must be construed in favor of borrowers because of the relative ease with which lenders can forfeit borrowers' interests and the lack of judicial oversight in conducting nonjudicial foreclosure sales." We have invalidated trustee sales that do not comply with the act.

As a pragmatic matter, it is the lenders, servicers, and their affiliates who appoint trustees. Trustees have considerable financial incentive to keep those appointing them happy and very little financial incentive to show the homeowners the same solicitude. However, despite these pragmatic considerations and incentives

> under our statutory system, a trustee is not merely an agent for the lender or the lender's successors. Trustees have obligations to all of the parties to the deed, including the homeowner. RCW 61.24.010(4) ("The trustee or successor trustee has a duty of good faith to the borrower, beneficiary, and grantor."); *Cox v. Helenius*, 103 Wash.2d 383, 389, 693 P.2d 683 (1985) ("[A] trustee of a deed of trust is a fiduciary for both the mortgagee and mortgagor and must act impartially between them.") (citing George E. Osborne, Grant S. Nelson & Dale A. Whitman, Real Estate Finance Law § 7.21 (1979)).

In a judicial foreclosure action, an impartial judge of the superior court acts as the trustee and the debtor has a one year redemption period. In a nonjudicial foreclosure, the trustee undertakes the role of the judge as an impartial third party who owes a duty to both parties to ensure that the rights of both the beneficiary and the debtor are protected. *Cox*, 103 Wash.2d at 389, 693 P.2d 683. While the legislature has established a mechanism for nonjudicial sales, neither due process nor equity will countenance a system that permits the theft of a person's property by a lender or its beneficiary under the guise of a statutory nonjudicial foreclosure.[10] An independent trustee who owes a duty to act in good faith to exercise a fiduciary duty to act impartially to fairly respect the interests of both the lender and the

[10]Washington courts have a long tradition of guarding property from being wrongfully appropriated through judicial process. When "a jury . . . returned a verdict which displeased [Territorial Judge J.E. Wyche] in a suit over 160 acres of land" he threatened to set aside their verdict and remarked, " 'While I am judge it takes thirteen men to steal a ranch.' "

debtor is a minimum to satisfy the statute, the constitution, and equity, at the risk of having the sale voided, title quieted in the original homeowner, and subjecting itself and the beneficiary to a CPA claim.[11]

The trustee argues that we "should not hold that it is unfair and deceptive either to honor a beneficiary's instructions not to postpone a sale without seeking its authorization, or to advise a grantor to contact her lender." We note that Quality contends that it did not have a practice of deferring to the lender but merely followed its "legally-mandated respect for its Beneficiary's instructions" and asserts that "[s]imply put, no competent Trustee would fail to respect its Beneficiary's instructions not to postpone a sale without first seeking the Beneficiary's permission." We disagree. The record supports the conclusion that Quality abdicated its duty to act impartially toward both sides.

Again, the trustee in a nonjudicial foreclosure action has been vested with incredible power. Concomitant with that power is an obligation to both sides to do more than merely follow an unread statute and the beneficiary's directions. If the trustee acts only at the direction of the beneficiary, then the trustee is a mere agent of the beneficiary and a deed of trust no longer embodies a three party transaction. If the trustee were truly a mere agent of the beneficiary there would be, in effect, only two parties with the beneficiary having tremendous power and no incentive to protect the statutory and constitutional property rights of the borrower.

We hold that the practice of a trustee in a nonjudicial foreclosure deferring to the lender on whether to postpone a foreclosure sale and thereby failing to exercise its independent discretion as an impartial third party with duties to both parties is an unfair or deceptive act or practice and satisfies the first element of the CPA. Quality failed to act in good faith to exercise its fiduciary duty to both sides and merely honored an agency relationship with one.

C. Predating Notarizations

Klem submitted evidence that Quality had a practice of having a notary predate notices of sale. This is often a part of the practice known as "robo-signing." Specifically, in this case, it appears that at least from 2004–

[11]We have not had occasion to fully analyze whether the nonjudicial foreclosure act . . . violates article I, section 3 of our state constitution's command that "[n]o person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." . . .

2007, Quality notaries regularly falsified the date on which documents were signed.

Quality suggests these falsely notarized documents are immaterial because the owner received the minimum notice required by law. This no-harm, no-foul argument again reveals a misunderstanding of Washington law and the purpose and importance of the notary's acknowledgment under the law. A signed notarization is the ultimate assurance upon which the whole world is entitled to rely that the proper person signed a document on the stated day and place. Local, interstate, and international transactions involving individuals, banks, and corporations proceed smoothly because all may rely upon the sanctity of the notary's seal. This court does not take lightly the importance of a notary's obligation to verify the signor's identity and the date of signing by having the signature performed in the notary's presence. *Werner v. Werner*, 84 Wash.2d 360, 526 P.2d 370 (1974). As amicus Washington State Bar Association notes, "The proper functioning of the legal system depends on the honesty of notaries who are entrusted to verify the signing of legally significant documents." While the legislature has not yet declared that it is a per se unfair or deceptive act for the purposes of the CPA, it is a crime in both Washington and California for a notary to falsely notarize a document. . . . A notary jurat is a public trust and allowing them to be deployed to validate false information strikes at the bedrock of our system. . . .

. . . We hold that the act of false dating by a notary employee of the trustee in a nonjudicial foreclosure is an unfair or deceptive act or practice and satisfies the first three elements under the Washington CPA.

The trustee argues as a matter of law that the falsely notarized documents did not cause harm. The trustee is wrong; a false notarization is a crime and undermines the integrity of our institutions upon which all must rely upon the faithful fulfillment of the notary's oath. There remains, however, the factual issue of whether the false notarization was a cause of plaintiff's damages. That is, of course, a question for the jury. We note that the plaintiff submitted evidence that the purpose of predated notarizations was to expedite the date of sale to please the beneficiary. Given the evidence that if the documents had been properly dated, the earliest the sale could have taken place was one week later. [sic] The plaintiff also submitted evidence that with one more week, it was "very possible" Puget Sound Guardians could have closed the sale. This additional time would also have provided the guardian more time to persuade WaMu to postpone the sale. But given the trustee's failure to fulfill its fiduciary duty to postpone the sale, there is sufficient evidence to support the jury's CPA violation verdict, and we need not reach whether this deceptive act was a cause of plaintiff's damages . . . .

Notes and Questions

1.21. What, if anything, is the relevance of the sale price of the home to the court's decision? Why would the bank bid a dollar more than what was owed on the loan?

1.22. *Klem* involves a variant on what is known as "robo-signing"—the creation of documents with important legal effects on foreclosure, without sufficient personal knowledge or even understanding by the person signing the document.

Jay Patterson, a forensic accountant who has examined hundreds of mortgage loans in bankruptcy or foreclosure, concluded that "95 percent of these loans contain some kind of mistake," from an unnecessary $15 late fee to thousands of dollars in fees and charges stemming from a single mistake that snowballed into a wrongful foreclosure. Most of these cases resulted in defaults, but when they were litigated, the facts could be telling. For example, one bankruptcy case, *In re Stewart*, involved a home in Jefferson Parish, New Orleans. Wells Fargo was the servicer. The debtor fell behind in her payments, and on September 12, 2005, Wells Fargo agents generated two opinions on the value of the home. Opinions require at least minimal inspection of the property. Stewart was charged $125 for each opinion. However, on September 12, 2005, Jefferson Parish was under an evacuation order due to the devastation then being wrought by Hurricane Katrina. These were only two of the numerous fees the bankruptcy judge found had been wrongly charged to Stewart.

What ought to be done to rein in servicer misbehavior of this sort?