



IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

The Honorable Mikell R. Scarborough, Master in Equity

Case No. 2010-CP-10-5825

Selene RMOF REO Acquisition, LLC.....Respondent,

v.

Melissa Furmanchik; Masonborough at Park West Association, Inc.
and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.,.....Defendants,

Of whom Melissa Furmanchik is the.....Appellant.

INITIAL REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

MARY LEIGH ARNOLD, P.A.
Mary Leigh Arnold
749 Johnnie Dodds Blvd. Suite B
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
Telephone: 843-971-6053
Facsimile: 843-971-6055
sammie@maryarnoldlaw.com
Attorney for Appellant

November 16, 2014

RECEIVED

NOV 19 2014

SC Court of Appeals

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE MASTER IN EQUITY ERRED BY GRANTING SUA
 SPONTE RELIEF.....1

II. STANDING DID NOT EXIST AT THE TIME OF FILING
 OF THE COMPLAINT OR AT THE TIME OF TRIAL.....1

CONCLUSION.....4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:

Bank of America, N.A. v. Draper, 405 S.C. 214,746 S.E. 2d 478 (Ct. App. 2013).....2

Daniel v. Nationstar Mortgage, 2014 Fla. App. LEXIS 16734, (October 13, 2014)).....2, 3

R & G Constr., Inc. v. Lowcountry Reg’l Transp. Auth., 343 S.C. 424, 540 S.E.2d 113 (Ct. App.2000)).....1

Wilder Corp. v. Wilke, 330 S.C. 71, 76, 497 S.E.2d 731, 733 (1998).....2

RULES:

Rule 50(d), SCRCP.....1

Rule 59(d), SCRCP.....1

I. THE MASTER IN EQUITY ERRED BY GRANTING SUA SPONTE RELIEF.

The Master in Equity cited to Rule 50(d), SCRCPP, when he granted sua sponte relief for a new trial for the benefit of Respondent. Respondent does not address any argument relating to Rule 50 or the case authority cited supporting the proposition that Rule 50, SCRCPP, does not provided for sua sponte relief. There being no response to the argument, the argument should be deemed resolved. R & G Constr., Inc. v. Lowcountry Reg'l Transp. Auth., 343 S.C. 424, 437, 540 S.E.2d 113, 120 (Ct. App.2000) (deeming an issue abandoned if the appellant's brief treats it in a conclusory manner).

Likewise, in the event the Court's reference to Rule 50(d), SCRCPP is considered a clerical error and the proper citation was to Rule 59(d), SCRCPP Respondent fails to address the time limitations imposed under Rule 59(d), SCRCPP. Respondent having failed to respond to the argument, the issue should be concluded. Lastly, Respondent failed to address the argument that the lower court strayed from its role as acting as a neutral. Thus, the Master in Equity erred by acting outside his allowed authority under Rule 50(d), SCRCPP or outside the allowed time period under Rule 59(d), SCRCPP.

II. STANDING DID NOT EXIST AT THE TIME OF FILING OF THE COMPLAINT OR AT THE TIME OF TRIAL.

Respondent, in essence, limited its responsive arguments relating to standing by making the conclusory remark that the original Plaintiff had standing at the time the case was filed. This is nothing more than a conclusory remark, in light of the fact that Respondent offered no testimony or qualified witness that could testify as to

Wachovia's standing at the time of filing. The only witness offered was an employee for a servicer of the subsequent holder. Thus, no meaningful response has been offered.

Additionally the argument relating to the divergent paths taken by the Note and Mortgage was not addressed. The Mortgage never reached the Respondent because the assignment of mortgage ended when it went in a different direction from the Note. Respondent lacked standing and the foreclosure should be reversed.

Interesting is the assertion by Respondent that it is the servicer of the subject note and mortgage and therefore has standing under the holdings of Bank of America, N.A. v. Draper, 405 S.C. 214, 746 S.E. 2d 478 (Ct. App. 2013). At the time of trial Respondent did not contend it was the servicer but rather the holder. Therefore this argument not having been raised it is not properly before this Court. Wilder Corp. v. Wilke, 330 S.C. 71, 76, 497 S.E.2d 731, 733 (1998) ("It is axiomatic that an issue cannot be raised for the first time on appeal, but must have been raised to and ruled upon by the trial judge to be preserved for appellate review.")

A recent case just decided by the Florida Court of Appeals in the past several months provides guidance on the issue of standing. In the case of Daniel v. Nationstar Mortgage, 2014 Fla. App. LEXIS 16734, (October 13, 2014) the Court determined that Nationstar failed to establish that the original plaintiff, Auora Loan Services LLC, had standing to foreclose at the time it filed the original complaint, and reversed the foreclosure. The Court noted that in order to prove standing to foreclose a mortgage, a plaintiff must show that it is the holder both of the mortgage and of the note the mortgage secures. Id. (citations omitted) "The plaintiff must

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

The Honorable Mikell R. Scarborough, Master in Equity

Case No. 2010-CP-10-5825

Selene RMOF REO Acquisition, LLC.....Respondent,

v.

Melissa Furmanchik; Masonborough at Park West Association, Inc.
and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.,.....Defendants,

Of whom Melissa Furmanchik is the.....Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 16th day of November 2014, I have served Initial Reply Brief of Appellant on opposing counsel of record by depositing a copy a in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

Jason Wyman, Esq.
Rogers Townsend & Thomas, PC
P.O. Box 100200
Columbia, SC 29202
Attorney for Respondent

MARY LEIGH ARNOLD, PA

Mary Leigh Arnold

RECEIVED

NOV 19 2014

SC Court of Appeals