

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
COURT OF APPEALS

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court

Appeal from RICHLAND COUNTY
Joseph M. Strickland, Master in Equity
Court of Common Pleas

Case No. 2011-CP-40-08074
Appellate Case No. 2014-000140
Opinion No. 2015-UP-444

RECEIVED

NOV 20 2015

S.C. Supreme Court

Bank of America, N.A., Respondent

v.

Duce Staley, Felicia Woods a/k/a Felicia B. Woods, SCBT, N.A., South Carolina Department of Revenue, Palmetto Health, Manheim Automotive Financial Services, Inc., and Spring Valley Homeowners' Association, Defendants,

And Willie Zimmerman, Third Party Participant, Petitioner

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Willie Zimmerman, Pro Se
106 Hever Court
Irmo, South Carolina 29063
Telephone: (803) 466-1372

Erica Greer Lybrand, Esquire and
Jason D. Wyman, Esquire of

Rogers Townsend & Thomas, PC
220 Executive Center Drive
Post Office Box 100200
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-3200
Telephone: (803)771-7900
Attorney for Respondent

FACTS

Appellant, Willie Zimmerman, was the successful bidder on a foreclosed residential property (25 Sunturf Circle, Columbia, South Carolina 29223) at the Richland County Courthouse (the bid) on April 1, 2013. Appellant also remitted the required 5% deposit of \$17,600.00. Appellant and Movement Mortgage, LLC (Lender) received an electronic copy of the signed purchase agreement (the contract) from Bernstein Law Firm (Closing Attorney). On or about April 16, 2013, the Lender requested from Bernstein Law Firm an extension of time to comply with the bid. Amber Gee (Bernstein Law Firm) contacted Korn Law Firm (Respondent Attorney) and made the request on the Lender's behalf. Korn Law Firm gave verbal and/or written approval to extend the compliance deadline to May 15, 2013.

On May 09, 2013, the Appellant called Earle Reese (Paralegal/Post Sale Manager at Korn Law Firm) to give a status report and to inquire if Bank of America NA (Respondent) would accept \$10,800.00 less than the \$352,000.00 bid price. Knowing that the compliance deadline was six days away, Appellant was looking at "all available options" in an effort to close by May 15, 2013. Earle Reese instructed the Appellant to attach a formal letter to an e-mail, requesting the adjustment.

Appellant waited some 40 days to hear from Respondent on whether the May 10 request had been accepted. Appellant also logged calls and e-mails requesting updates. On June 18, 2013, Earle Reese sent Appellant an e-mail marked "Approved" (from the Respondent) with the adjusted price of \$341,200.00.

1. BECAUSE APPELLANT IN NO WAY CONTRIBUTED TO THE MISTAKE MADE BY THE RESPONDENT, THE COURT ERRED IN SETTING ASIDE THE APRIL 1, 2013, FORECLOSER SALE 2

2. BECAUSE THE JUDICIAL SALE NEITHER INVOLVED AN INADEQUATE PRICE SO GROSS AS TO SHOCK THE CONSCIENCE, NOR WERE THERE OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WARRANTED INTERFERENCE FOR THE COURT, THE COURT ERRED IN SETTING ASIDE THE APRIL 1, 2013, FORECLOSER SALE 2

INDEX

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
Certificate of Counsel.....	ii
Question Presented.....	4
Statement of the Case.....	4
Arguments:	
1. WHETHER THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED IN FAILING TO RULE THAT BECAUSE APPELLANT IN NO WAY CONTRIBUTED TO THE MISTAKE MADE BY THE RESPONDENT, THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN SETTING ASIDE THE APRIL 1, 2013, FORECLOSER SALE	5
2. WHETHER THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED IN FAILING TO RULE THAT BECAUSE THE JUDICIAL SALE NEITHER INVOLVED AN INADEQUATE PRICE SO GROSS AS TO SHOCK THE CONSCIENCE, NOR WERE THERE OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WARRANTED INTERFERENCE FROM THE COURT, THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN SETTING ASIDE THE APRIL 1, 2013, FORECLOSER SALE ...	5
Conclusion	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Eastern Savings Bank, FSB v. Albert J. Sanders, Jr. Opinion No. 4234	5
Hill v. S.C. Department of Health & Environmental Control, 389 S.C. 1, 698 S.E. 2d 612 (2010).....	5
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Barbara S. Tuner, Opinion No. 4376	5

Certificate of Counsel

The undersigned hereby certifies that this Writ of Certiorari complies with Rule 242(d), SCACR.

Petitioner, Pro Se certifies that the Petition for Rehearing was made and finally ruled on by the Court of Appeals on October 23, 2015.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Did the Court of Appeals err in upholding the Trial Court's vacation of sale?
2. Did the Court of Appeals err in not reversing the Trial Court's setting aside of the sale, when the sale did not involve an inadequate price so as to shock the conscience.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant, Willie Zimmerman, was the successful bidder on a foreclosed residential property (25 Sunturf Circle, Columbia, South Carolina 29223) at the Richland County Courthouse (the bid). On June 21, 2013, Appellant was contacted by Susan Goldston (Manager, Master-in-Equity) to give notice that the Master wanted to hold a status conference at the courthouse to discuss the loan proceedings.

On July 30, 2013, the Master signed the Order to Vacate Sale and later returned the 5% Deposit to the Appellant.

ARGUMENT

The law is well established that the policy of the Courts to uphold judicial sales when regularly made, and when it can be done with violating principle or doing injustice. A judicial sale will not be set aside except for cogent reasons. The purpose of the law and of proceeding in which a sale has been decreed is that it shall be final. Spillers v. Clay, 233 S.C. 99, 104, 103 S.E. 2d 759, 761-62 (1958)

If neither the officer making the sale, nor the purchaser contributed to the mistake nor the sale was fair and regularly conducted, the sale shall not be set aside. The Court erred in setting aside the sale because of a mistake of the Respondent, Bank of America. The voiding of the sale by the Master-in-Equity should be reversed.

Respondent argues that Appellant did not make a timely objection to the July 30, 2013 Court order vacating the sale. Respondent concedes that there was no mistake on the part of the Appellant. Respondent further argues that a contemporaneous objection is required to preserve an issue for appellate review. Respondent cites Hill v. S.C. Department of Health & Environmental Control, 389 S.C. 1, 23, 698 S.E. 2d 612, 624 (2010). Respondent cites the cases as authority, rather than the fact that those were arguments made in the case on appeal.

The court clearly ruled that the assertion made by the Respondent in that case, which is the same assertion of the Respondent, in this case, is without merit. The failure to preserve and issue for appeal does not deprive an Appellate in Appellate Court of jurisdiction to hear the appeal. To deprive the Appellant, the right to appeal an erroneous ruling would represent a denial of Appellant right to procedural and substantive due process. The Appellant has a right to be heard and certainly should not be deprived of property rights with due process of law. Appellant followed the correct procedures in the bidding process and the sale was validated because of an error that was of no fault of the Appellant.

Similarly, the respondent argues that this appeal was filed more than thirty days after the execution of the order and subsequent to the second order vacating a second sale issue on December 17, 2013. Respondents appear to have overlapped the concepts of issues of preservation and timely notice of appeal. The respondent's argument is clearly without merit and was clearly rejected in Hill vs. S.C. Department of Health & Environmental Control, 389 S.C. 1, 23, 698 S.E. 2d 612, 624 (2010).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, petitioner ask the Court to grant the petition for a writ of certiorari.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Willie Zimmerman", written over a horizontal line.

Willie Zimmerman, Pro Se
106 Hever Court
Irmo, South Carolina 29063
Telephone: (803)466-1372

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals

Appeal from RICHLAND COUNTY

Court of Common Pleas

Joseph M. Strickland, Master in Equity

Case No. 2014-000140

Appellate Case No. 2014-000140

Opinion No. 2015-UP-144

RECEIVED

NOV 20 2015

S.C. Supreme Court

Bank of America, N.A.,

Respondent,

v.

Duce Staley, Felicia Woods a/k/a Felicia B. Woods, SCBT, N.A., South Carolina Department of Revenue, Palmetto Health, Manheim Automotive Financial Services, Inc., and Spring Valley Homeowners' Association, Defendants,

And Willie Zimmerman, Third Party Participant,

Petitioner

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Willie Zimmerman, served upon the SC Court of Appeals this PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI by placing the same in the United States Mail, first class postage prepaid, addressed to the following as shown this 20th day of November, 2015.



Willie Zimmerman, Pro Se

P.O. Box 2013

Irmo, SC 29063

Telephone: (803) 466-1372

Clerk of Court
SC Court of Appeals
Columbia, SC 29201