

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Mikell R. Scarborough, Charleston County Master in Equity
Civil Action No. 2010-CP-10-06945

Appellate Case No. 2014-001398

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. Respondent,

v.

Ronald R. Watkins and Ashland Property Owners Association, Inc.,

Of Whom Ronald R. Watkins is Appellant.

FINAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

Thomas E. Lydon
McAngus, Goudelock & Courie
1320 Main Street, 10th Floor
Post Office Box 12519
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
(803) 779-2300
Attorney for Respondent

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas
Mikell R. Scarborough, Charleston County Master in Equity
Civil Action No. 2010-CP-10-06945

Appellate Case No. 2014-001398

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. Respondent,

v.

Ronald R. Watkins and Ashland Property Owners Association, Inc.,

Of Whom Ronald R. Watkins isAppellant.

FINAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

Thomas E. Lydon
McAngus, Goudelock & Courie
1320 Main Street, 10th Floor
Post Office Box 12519
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
(803) 779-2300
Attorney for Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	ii
Statement of Issue on Appeal.....	1
Statement of the Case.....	1
Statement of Facts.....	2
Arguments	
I. THE MASTER IN EQUITY PROPERLY GRANTED PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BECAUSE THE DEFENSE OF UNCLEAN HANDS DOES NOT APPLY TO THIS FORECLOSURE ACTION.....	3
A. Standard of Review.....	3
B. The Master in Equity Correctly Ruled That the Affirmative Defense of Unclean Hands Does Not Prevent Wells Fargo from Foreclosing its Mortgages.....	4
Conclusion	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>BAC Home Loan Servicing v. Kinder</i> , 398 S.C. 619, 731 S.E.2d 547 (2012).....	5, 6
<i>Fleming v. Rose</i> , 350 S.C. 488, 567 S.E.2d 857 (2002).....	4
<i>Franklin v. Chavis</i> , 371 S.C. 527, 640 S.E.2d 873 (2007).....	6
<i>George v. Fabri</i> , 345 S.C. 440, 548 S.E.2d 868 (2001).....	3
<i>Matrix Financial Services Corp. v. Frazer</i> , 394 S.C. 134, 714 S.E.2d 532 (2011).....	5, 6
<i>Wachovia Bank v. Coffey</i> , 398 S.C. 76, 698 S.E.2d 244 (Ct. App. 2010)	4, 5
<i>Wachovia Bank v. Coffey</i> , Op. No. 27282 (S.C. Sup. Ct. filed July 10, 2013).....	6

Rule

Rule 56(c), SCRCP.....	4
------------------------	---

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE ON APPEAL

Did the Master in Equity Err in Granting the Lender's Motion for Summary Judgment in a Foreclosure Action Where All Aspects of the Mortgage Loan Transaction Were Not Handled by a South Carolina Attorney?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This appeal arises out of a foreclosure action filed by Respondent Wells Fargo Bank against Appellant Ronald R. Watkins. In response to the foreclosure complaint, Appellant Watkins filed an Answer and Counterclaims. Wells Fargo then filed a Reply to the Answer and Counterclaims. After exchanging written discovery, Appellant Watkins filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. Wells Fargo then filed a Motion to Dismiss or for Summary Judgment with respect to Respondent's counterclaims, along with a Motion for Order of Reference.

The motions were argued before the Honorable Roger M. Young on September 6, 2011. On October 27, 2011, Judge Young entered an Order granting the motions filed by Wells Fargo and denying Appellant's motion for summary judgment. On November 15, 2011, Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal of Judge Young's Order.

On appeal, Appellant argued that Judge Young erred in dismissing his counterclaims and in denying his motion for summary judgment based on the affirmative defense of unclean hands. The South Carolina Court of Appeals affirmed Judge Young's Order dismissing the counterclaims and dismissed Appellant's appeal of the denial of his motion for summary judgment on the unclean hands defense. The case was then remitted to the lower court for further proceedings.

After the case was remitted to the lower court, Wells Fargo filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on its cause of action to foreclose the mortgage. The Motion was

heard by Judge Mikell R. Scarborough on April 21, 2014. On May 28, 2014, Judge Scarborough entered an Order granting the Motion for Summary Judgment. Appellant timely served the Notice for this appeal on June 20, 2014.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On June 15, 2007, Appellant Ronald R. Watkins (“Borrower”) entered into two mortgage loan transactions with World Savings Bank, FSB. Borrower executed a promissory note and first mortgage in the amount of \$398,000, and a promissory note and second mortgage in the amount of \$49,000. Both of the mortgages were recorded on July 24, 2007 (R. p. 17, ¶ 8). World Savings Bank was subsequently acquired by Wachovia Bank, N.A. Thereafter, Wachovia Bank merged with Well Fargo Bank, N.A. (“Wells Fargo”). Wells Fargo is now the owner and holder of the promissory notes and mortgages that are the subject of this action. (R. p. 17, ¶ 8).

The loans that are the subject of this foreclosure are secured by mortgages on a house located in Charleston County. (R. p. 17, ¶ 8). Borrower admits that he signed the promissory notes and mortgages that are the subject of this action. (R. p. 23, ¶ 5). He also does not dispute that he received the loans in question (R. p. 128, lines 17-21).

The loan closing took place in a Wachovia Bank branch in Charleston, South Carolina. (R. p. 114, ¶ 3). For each loan, a title company hired by the lender handled the issuance of the title insurance commitment, the issuance of title insurance policy, the recording of documents, and the disbursement of funds. (R. p. 114, ¶ 4). An attorney admitted to practice in South Carolina was present at the closing, and the attorney witnessed and notarized Borrower’s signatures on the mortgages.¹

¹ Borrower asserts in his Initial Brief that Wells Fargo stipulated that “the loans were closed as witness only closings.” However, the Transcript of Hearing clearly states that the stipulation was solely for the purpose

In September of 2009, Borrower stopped making the monthly payments due on the mortgage loans. (R. p. 38-39, ¶ 5, 8). In 2010, Wells Fargo filed this action to foreclose the mortgages. In response to the foreclosure complaint, Borrower asserted affirmative defenses and counterclaims alleging that the loan documents were unenforceable because of the involvement of the title company in handling various aspects of the transaction.

It is important to note that Borrower does not dispute that he signed the promissory notes and mortgages. (R. p. 23, ¶ 5). He does not assert that he did not receive the proceeds from the loans. (R. p. 121, lines 4-7). He does not assert that the proceeds from the loans were not properly disbursed. He does not deny that he failed to make payments when due on the loans. Instead, he simply wants the loans cancelled in their entirety because all aspects of the loan closings were not handled by a South Carolina attorney. (R. p. 121, lines 6-15).

ARGUMENT

I. THE MASTER IN EQUITY PROPERLY GRANTED PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BECAUSE THE DEFENSE OF UNCLEAN HANDS DOES NOT APPLY TO THIS FORECLOSURE ACTION.

A. Standard of Review

"The purpose of summary judgment is to expedite the disposition of cases which do not require the services of a fact finder." *George v. Fabri*, 345 S.C. 440, 452, 548 S.E.2d 868, 874 (2001). Summary judgment is proper when there is no genuine issue as to any material fact, and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *Fleming v. Rose*, 350 S.C. 488, 493, 567 S.E.2d 857, 860 (2002), *citing* Rule 56(c),

of the hearing on the motion for summary judgment and in order to ensure that there is no issue of fact. (R.

SCRCP. For the purpose of the motion for summary judgment heard by the Master in Equity, Wells Fargo did not dispute the facts alleged by Borrower concerning the loan closing that is the subject of his affirmative defense of unclean hands. Therefore, there were no issues of fact, only questions of law on which summary judgment is appropriate.

B. The Master in Equity Correctly Ruled That the Affirmative Defense of Unclean Hands Does Not Prevent Wells Fargo from Foreclosing Its Mortgages.

For the purpose of the motions presented to the lower court, Wells Fargo agreed that the closings of the loans that are the subject of this action were “witness only” closings. (R. p. 123, lines 14-25). That is, although an attorney was present at the closing, the attorney merely witnessed signatures and notarized the loan documents as necessary for them to be recordable in the office of the register of deeds. Other tasks related to the closing, such as the issuance of the title insurance commitment, the issuance of the title insurance policy, and the recording of documents were handled by a title company hired by the lender. Borrower contends that because these were witness only closings, Wells Fargo should be barred from enforcing the notes and mortgages.

In support of his argument, Borrower relies on the decision of the South Carolina Court of Appeals in *Wachovia Bank v. Coffey*, 398 S.C. 76, 698 S.E.2d 244 (Ct. App. 2010). However, the facts in *Coffey* are distinguishable from the present case. Moreover, the South Carolina Supreme Court has issued three opinions since *Coffey* which make it clear that Wells Fargo is entitled to enforce the promissory notes and mortgages that are the subject of this foreclosure action.

Wachovia Bank v. Coffey is distinguishable from the present case because the defendant homeowner in *Coffey* had not signed the mortgage that was the subject of the

p. 123, lines 19-22.)

lawsuit, and the lender was seeking equitable relief against the homeowner based on theories of ratification, unjust enrichment, equitable lien, and equitable subordination. In the cases before this Court, Borrower admits that he signed the loan documents, and Wells Fargo is pursuing standard mortgage foreclosure actions.

Since the *Coffey* decision in 2010, the South Carolina Supreme Court has issued two opinions in which it held that if a mortgage loan is closed without an attorney being present, the loan documents are enforceable, except with respect to any closings which occur after August 8, 2011. See *BAC Home Loan Servicing v. Kinder*, 398 S.C. 619, 731 S.E.2d 547 (2012); *Matrix Financial Services Corp. v. Frazer*, 394 S.C. 134, 714 S.E.2d 532 (2011).

In *Matrix Financial Services Corp.*, the lender hired a title company to perform the title search, prepare the documents, and close the loan – all without the supervision of an attorney licensed in South Carolina. The Supreme Court held that this constituted the unauthorized practice of law and held that “a lender may not enjoy the benefit of equitable remedies when that lender failed to have attorney supervision during the loan process as required by law.” However, the Court went on to state that this ruling applies only “to filing dates after the issuance of this opinion.” This opinion was issued on August 8, 2011, and the mortgages that are the subject of this action were signed and recorded in 2007, more than four years before the deadline established in the *Matrix Financial* opinion. More recently, in *BAC Home Loan Servicing v. Kinder*, the Court reiterated that the holding in *Matrix Financial* is prospective only and that mortgages recorded prior to August 8, 2011 are enforceable, regardless of whether the closing was supervised by an attorney.

Finally, the Supreme Court also addressed the Court of Appeals' decision in *Coffey* in *Wachovia Bank, N.A. v. Coffey*, Op. No. 27282 (Sup. Ct. filed July 10, 2013). The Supreme Court noted that the issues presented were whether the fact that the mortgage loan closing took place without an attorney present resulted in the lender having unclean hands and whether, as a result, the lender was barred from pursuing legal remedies. The Court affirmed the results of the Court of Appeals' holding in *Coffey*, but modified the analysis and reasoning. Specifically, the Supreme Court did not hold that the lender had unclean hands, but instead ruled that the lender simply could not foreclose on a mortgage that had not been signed by the owner of the property. Therefore, in its opinions in both *Matrix Financial* and *Coffey*, the Supreme Court declined to rule that a lender had unclean hands by virtue of the fact that an attorney was not present at the closing.


The Supreme Court's decisions in *Matrix Financial* and *Coffey* are consistent with its opinions and analysis in other cases involving the unauthorized practice of law. For example, in *Franklin v. Chavis*, 371 S.C. 527, 640 S.E.2d 87 (2007), the Court found that the preparation of a will by a nonlawyer constituted the unauthorized practice of law. However, the Court refused to void the will, holding that "it should not be invalidated simply because it was drafted by a nonlawyer." 371 S.C. at 535, 640 S.E.2d at 877. Likewise, a properly executed promissory note and mortgage should not be invalidated simply because the transaction was not handled by an attorney.

CONCLUSION

The mortgages that are the subject of this action were recorded more than four years before August 8, 2011. Therefore, based on the South Carolina Supreme Court's

holdings in *Matrix Financial*, *BAC Home Loan Servicing*, and *Wachovia v. Coffey*, the mortgages that are the subject of this foreclosure action are enforceable, regardless of whether all aspects of the mortgage loan transaction were handled by a South Carolina attorney. Accordingly, the Order Granting Summary Judgment to Wells Fargo should be affirmed.

McANGUS, GOUDELOCK & COURIE, L.L.C.



Thomas E. Lydon

1320 Main Street, 10th Floor

Post Office Box 12519

Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Attorney for Respondent Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

December 22, 2014

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

DEC 30 2014

SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
Court of Common Pleas

Mikell R. Scarborough, Charleston County Master in Equity
Civil Action No. 2010-CP-10-6945

Appellate Case No. 2014-001398

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. Respondent,

v.


Ronald R. Watkins and Ashland Property Owners Association, Inc.,

Of Whom Ronald R. Watkins is Appellant.

RESPONDENT'S CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 211(b)

I hereby certify the Respondent's Final Brief is in compliance with Rule 211(b), SCACR

McANGUS, GOUDELOCK & COURIE, L.L.C.



Thomas E. Lydon
1320 Main Street, 10th Floor
Post Office Box 12519
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
Attorney for Respondent Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

December 22, 2014

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

DEC 30 2014

SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY

Court of Common Pleas

Mikell R. Scarborough, Charleston County Master in Equity

Civil Action No. 2010-CP-10-06945

Appellate Case No. 2014-001398

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. Respondent,

v.


Ronald R. Watkins and Ashland Property Owners Association, Inc.,

Of Whom Ronald R. Watkins is Appellant.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this 30th day of December, 2014, served the Final Brief of Respondent by mailing a copy of it, postage prepaid, in the United States mail, with sufficient postage affixed as follows:

Brian M. Knowles, Esquire
Post Office Box 50201
Summerville, SC 29485



Thomas E. Lydon
McAngus, Goudelock & Courie, LLC
Post Office Box 12519
Columbia, SC 29211
Attorney for Appellant