SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY CHANCERY DIVISION - HUDSON COUNTY DOCKET NO. F-18446-08

U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, AS TRUSTEE FOR CSAB MORTGAGE-BACKED PASS-THROUGH CERTIFICATES SERIES

2006-1,

Plaintiff,

: TRANSCRIPT

of HEARING

ν.

XAVIER SINCHEGARCIA.

Defendant.

PLACE: Hudson County Courthouse

583 Newark Avenue

Jersey City, NJ 07306

DATE: May 27, 2009

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE THOMAS P. OLIVIERI, P.J. CH.

TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:

MARGARET LAMBE JUROW, ESQ. LEGAL SERVICES OF NEW JERSEY

APPEARANCES:

FRANCIS S. HALLINAN, ESQ. BRIAN YODER, ESO. (PHELAN, HALLINAN & SCHMIEG, LLP) Attorney for Plaintiffs

DANIEL S. BERNHEIM, 3D., ESQ. (WILENTZ GOLDMAN & SPITZER, P.A.) Attorney for Plaintiffs

XAVIER SINCHEGARCIA Pro Se

> CAREYANN SHAFTAN, CSR, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER HUDSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE 583 NEWARK AVENUE JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY 07306

MR. YODER: What occurred, your Honor --

25

11||

THE COURT: Just help me out.

MR. HALLINAN: That is correct. I am familiar with the letter, and I am familiar with exactly what happened when the issue arose before Judge Todd.

While the law firm believes that nothing improper has occurred, it took Judge Todd's concerns for which he did an extensive search and determined that there were approximately 4,000 assignments which had been executed by Mr. Strain.

THE COURT: Three thousand in the letter. It was four?

MR. HALLINAN: It was three.

MR. BERNHEIM: I may be misstating what was in the letter. What the law firm then did, it decided to have all of the assignments re-executed so that there would be no question about the issues of having, you know, the notaries acknowledged in the fashion that Judge Todd raised as a concern.

THE COURT: Does it include this one?

MR. HALLINAN: It includes this one. We have here for your Honor a copy of the corrected assignment.

THE COURT: Can we make a copy not only for me, but for the defendant, as well?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  HALLINAN: We have one of those, as well. I will hand one over.

THE COURT: And you have one for me?

MR. HALLINAN: Yes, I do, your Honor.

(Handing to Court Officer)

MR. HALLINAN: This corrected assignment was executed by Michelle Bradford, who is also a partner in the law firm, was authorized as well by MERS to execute the assignments. And we have an affidavit of certification as to the manner she went through the execution of this assignment which, if I could hand this up to the Court as well, I would appreciate that, and I have a copy for the defendant.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. HALLINAN: And the thought process was try to eliminate any concerns, whether we agree or disagree with them. We were aware that Judge Todd had notified members of the bench of the issues that had been before him, and of his concerns.

So the effort was made and considerable time and out-of-pocket expense by the law firm to do this.

THE COURT: I read in the letter that the expense at least was significant.

MR. HALLINAN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I referenced that letter and to make sure that this was one of the assignments that I assumed it was, but until I

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

received the corrective assignment and the attorney certification I wasn't sure. Give me a minute, let me just

MR. HALLINAN: Certainly.

THE COURT: -- address the defendant.

The reason, if you remember, sir, for the Court's scheduling this hearing was the concern that it had regarding the assignment that had been executed in this matter and notarized, and the concern that the Court had was that the notarization, I infer, did not take place when the actual signature was placed on the document.

As a result of what I just heard from counsel, that issue no longer technically is on the table, so to speak, since the assignment now has been executed albeit certainly after the Complaint was filed. But so I just wanted to let you know that.

If you remember, I gave you certain documents when you were last here so you could review them. unaware at that time that the law firm was taking this type of corrective action.

The letter that was sent to Judge Todd was dated April, was dated April 29, received by the Court, meaning Judge Todd, on May 4, according to his stamp.

So I mean from where I sit, quite frankly, I am not as concerned now about the assignment as I was when we

were last here.

MR. SINCH

THE COURT: For example?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: For example, I just received

Now, I would like to hear your thoughts on that, though, since you have a right to be heard regarding this matter.

First of all, you understand the documents that were just handed to you? Do you understand what they are?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I want to make sure you understand what the documents are.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: It is, I am trying to -- I have lawyers against myself and forgive me if I am not correct.

THE COURT: That is okay. That's why I want to make sure I asked you if you understand the documents you were given because you are representing yourself.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I understand the only reason that they took these corrective actions was because it was brought up.

THE COURT: Because of what?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Because it was brought up as a question. I have other questions. When I filed it first, who is say they don't have other -- they are not correct, the other things they claim to be correcting.

-- maybe not just, I did not bring it with me -- paperwork in a large envelope saying that I received it personally or that I signed for it.

THE COURT: When you say "it," what do you mean?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Just that paperwork, the last
envelope they sent it. They always send letters to me that
I received it or signed it personally, and I didn't.
That's one of the questions that I bring up.

THE COURT: Let me focus on the issue that caused me to schedule the hearing, first, and then we can talk about some of these other matters in a minute.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: But I just want to focus now on the hearing, and the record should reflect it was the Court that raised the issue and scheduled a hearing and asked Mr. Hallinan to be here.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, sir.

of mortgage has been executed by Ms. Bradford presumably in the presence of the notary, Angela McFadden, I am suggesting to you that this Court is not as concerned about — we can discuss whether or not it is a substantive or procedural problem, but I am not as concerned about having Mr. Hallinan testify about how he executed the original assignment of mortgage.

Now, if you want to raise other issues apart from this, that is fine, but I am kind of asking you about this issue. This is the reason we are all here today and the reason why I scheduled the hearing.

So I am asking you about that.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I understand your question, your Honor. I don't have anything.

THE COURT: I am sorry?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  SINCHEGARCIA: There is nothing that I could ask. Nothing that I can add to that.

what my job is, that is what my job is, and I have to say this, yeah, I mean different people who are involved in the foreclosure process, and what I mean by that, I am talking about attorneys, nonattorneys, members of the bench, other members of the bar, could debate on whether or not failure to have the notary personally notarize the execution of the assignment is fatal to a foreclosure matter.

I don't necessarily need to get there today because I am satisfied that in this matter, A, there has been a corrective assignment that I am told was notarized properly and I don't need to ask Mr. Hallinan any questions about that. But I want to say something a little bit more.

I don't -- obviously I don't know what is going to happen with Judge Todd's matter. I understand it was

And I am satisfied that I don't need to pursue

that in this case. It is only one case.

I don't speak for my other brothers and sisters throughout the state, I can only speak for me in this case.

But I don't think I would be doing my job if I didn't say,

MR. HALLINAN: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- to Federal court and whatever happens, happens there. Not that it is not a concern to me, but it is not before me. This case is.

I feel very strongly that regarding the foreclosure process, sometimes there are actions taken simply to move the matter along more quickly, and this might be one of those, might be one of those processes whereby instead of doing it properly the first time, for the purpose of expediency it wasn't done properly and don't think anyone -- I don't think we can disagree or should disagree that having someone notarize a document saying that it was done in the presence, the signing was done in the presence, is done -- is improper for the purpose of notarization. And some might argue, and I know some have, certainly from the plaintiff's bar it is form over substance and should not affect the foreclosure.

I don't need to get there today in this case for the reasons I have said. It was corrected.

4

5

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and again this is just Judge Olivieri, I don't think although I am a Chair in the Conference of General Equity judges, I am not speaking as Chair of the Conference, I am speaking as the General Equity judge in the Hudson vicinage, that sometimes for the purposes of expediency and moving the matter along certain formalities are overlooked or shunned or disregarded, and they may be simple informalities, but they are important formalities.

I think it is important that when a notary indicates that he or she saw the person, or the person was in his or her presence and signed the assignment, that that be accurate and not be something that is inaccurate. Something that didn't happen.

So I just want to say that going forward I hope and trust that when other formalities -- that when plaintiff's bar or the plaintiffs are faced with other formalities in the execution of documents regarding assignments, that these formalities aren't overlooked.

We have spent a fair amount of time. You have, your firm.

Honestly, the judges have spent a lot of time on this issue and it is unnecessary and the only reason why we are spending all this time is because a formality was overlooked or disregarded.

For me, the formality is important because I

think when we overlook or shun or disregard formalities such as these notarizations, and if the Bench countenances overlooking those types of formalities, it is a slippery slope that we start to climb, overlooking perhaps other more substantive formalities, and this is too important of a process, meaning the foreclosure process, to overlook those types of formalities.

I am not speaking for the defendants, I am speaking for this General Equity Judge. Again, not as the Chair of the Conference. So I just ask going forward that when faced with doing it the correct way as opposed to the expedient way, that you choose the former rather than the latter, or else — and again only speaking for myself, we are going to be in the same position, and I don't know what formality might be overlooked and I, quite frankly, Don't know what action this particular judge will take.

I can only tell you that based upon the letter that was sent to Judge Todd which I obviously have a copy of, and the actions taken by your firm to correct overlooking the formality, I am satisfied that I don't need to question anyone.

I am inferring that it won't happen again. And when I say again, I am talking about inappropriate notarizations and other like formalities.

Can't get sloppy. It is too important. And it

really sends, it sends an inappropriate message to the public that the Bar and the Bench would overlook those types of formalities.

Again, honestly, if this corrective assignment of mortgage hadn't been executed properly, I infer we would have had a preliminary hearing today and I don't know what would happen today. I am not in the habit of giving advisory rulings.

It was a concern to me when it was first raised in the matter before Judge Todd and when I realized I had a similar matter before me.

So that is all I wanted to say. I think it is important that we  $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$ 

MR. HALLINAN: May I just very briefly?

THE COURT: -- honor those formalities. Yes.

MR. HALLINAN: Your Honor, I came here and I stated today that I represent U.S. Bank National Association as trustee in this matter.

I have also for a number of years had what I state sincerely as the privilege of serving as counsel to the law firm of Phelan, Hallinan & Schmieg, and represented them in a number of different varieties and have found that the folks there take to heart what it is that they are doing and recognize at the end of the day they may be depriving or -- not depriving, but somebody may lose their

home and they never lose sight of that and, in my experience, never had and it is a result of that recognition that they went through this process to do the corrective assignments because I agree with your Honor, one could make the argument not only is it form over substance because there is not only one assignment that Mr. Strain notarized that does not have Mr. Hallinan's signature.

THE COURT: No one was suggesting that there was forgery at all. Never been the issue here.

MR. HALLINAN: So the actual acknowledgement itself does indicate this is the signature of the person who signed it, the person who signed it had authority to execute those assignments, but it was in recognition of the comment that you made that it indicates they are in the presence of, and we could state because you know a group of them were, and a group of them were not. But we couldn't tell you on any given assignment which was and which wasn't. It was almost like asking the short order cook do you recall flipping which hamburger on which day.

In recognition of that and the possibility that there was not a technical accuracy, they went through what was a significant out-of-pocket expense on their own.

In addition to the form over substance debate is the legal issue that the actual assignment already occurred through the PSA and that is done --

\_

\_\_\_

THE COURT: I don't need to get there.

MR. HALLINAN: And I recognize that. The only reason that I point that out is not to taste whether the wine is good, or how the grapes are stomped, but I wanted the Court, given its comments, to understand that the law firm as well as the clients that they have represented that have been involved in these matters including MERS, have taken to heart what the issue is and said look, we need to be more than technically correct given what is going on in the world today, especially with all of the foreclosures and in the world of securitized mortgagees, that we realize nobody understands how these processes work all that well, to make sure we have done it properly for the integrity not only of the system, but in fairness to all of the defendants involved, the investors that are involved, and everyone else.

So the effort was made, and again it was -- as time consuming as it was, expensive as it was, in recognition of that, so that your Honor and anybody else who sits in a similar situation would not have to deal with this issue and take the time and expense for everybody involved.

THE COURT: I can speak for the Conference in this regard. I don't want to have to deal with this type of issue again. That, I am confident that I speak for the

Conference in that.

MR. HALLINAN: Equal confidence. Either do we. And I know as a fact that the firm has taken a look at its own processes and procedures and on a regular basis, notwithstanding this, tries to make sure that it complies with all of the rules as they exist and to advance what they are doing because it is not only counterproductive for the Court and the defendants, but also for their clients.

So there is a lot of different motivators that are out there to make sure that neither this or anything similar occurs.

THE COURT: I appreciate it and I hope, I think you do, I am sure the firm does, appreciates the Court's comments about these types of formalities. They are not just formalities in my opinion. They go beyond that because these formalities sometimes are the underpinning of the process that we go through, and if we don't adhere to them, again, I think we start going up a slippery slope and what is just a formality, I think it impacts the process negatively.

So enough said, and I really do appreciate it.

I can say when I read the letter that was subsequent to

Judge Todd and it was passed out to every member of the

Conference because the letter says please share this with

the Conference, I was impressed that you spent, as the

letter says, 175, upwards of \$175,000 to correct the issue or the problem.

Again, I can only tell you how I am reacting in this case. I don't speak for any other judge in this regard, I only speak for this judge in this case. That is because that is the only thing that is before me, and after explaining it to the defendant as best as I could and asking the defendant if he had any questions on that issue, he claimed no.

I am done with that issue in this case. Okay.

MR. HALLINAN: Very well.

THE COURT: So you can stay if you would like, I don't intend to call you, I am satisfied that the message was sent and received.

MR. HALLINAN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Now, I want to get back to the other issues that you raised because I am not sure I understand them. I understand the words, but I want to make sure I understand what you are saying regarding these documents which were sent to you which you say claim to have your signature on them and they are not.

Can you just tell me, when you were receiving these documents, was this in the context of discovery?

Just help me out with that.

R

ΤC

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Sure, your Honor. I had something served, I am aware I had to be served and I had to be served personally.

THE COURT: You are talking about with the summons and complaint?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, your Honor.

That amongst other things I have received in the mail which says that -- on the letter itself that I received it was served personally or certified. I don't believe I have that, those papers if front of me, but they were just mailed to me.

THE COURT: Hold on for a second because I want to check something of my own here. Hold on a second. I don't know if I have the entire file out here. One second.

And I don't. Help me out with this, either side. Have we had a case management conference in this case?

MR. BERNHEIM: No. This was before your Honor on a motion to vacate final judgment.

THE COURT: Okay. Since I don't have the file

Now, so I understand where we are at in this case, one of the -- one of the issues that you are raising to vacate the final judgment is that you were not served originally with the summons and complaint?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

23

24

25

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, your Honor, that is one of the things that I am asking.

These formalities and procedures, that's all I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have your file with you in this? Do you have the underlying file?

MR. HALLINAN: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Would it be worth everybody's while for the defendant and one or both or all of you to go into  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  conference room and show the defendant what exists regarding this case? Because sometimes that type of communication goes a long way to resolving some of the issues.

MR. HALLINAN: We certainly can try so we can walk him through what was served when. I think one of the issues was that there was some certified mail that was delivered to the home and it has a signature with his name on it which he asserts it was not his name, somebody else might have signed it. Maybe we can flush out what the issues are.

THE COURT: As a threshold matter preliminarily, would it help you if you were to go into my conference room and be shown whatever documents you do not have? Again, I do not know.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Your Honor, they have sent me

listing the description of the individual who received that service.

23

24

25

THE COURT: I don't want to waste your time if there is nothing in there that is going to help. Sometimes

there is, sometimes there isn't. But if you have been sent everything that there is, let's get some focus how we are going to proceed rather than — this is your motion to vacate final judgment request, an informal request, and I do this pretty much in every case wherein a defendant attempts to vacate judgment on these types of issues, defendants gets sworn, placed under oath, testifies as to the reason why he thinks the, in this case service, was defective.

He is cross-examined or she is cross-examined, presents whatever other witnesses they want to present, then the plaintiff can produce witnesses if he chooses to who will testify about service or whatever is raised, cross-examined by the defendant, and then I rule. That is how it is done.

So if you want to testify before the Court on the issue of service and, quite frankly, whatever else you have raised in your motion to vacate final judgment that's been filed, this would be your opportunity.

Do you wish to do that?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why don't you come on up here to the witness stand, and we do have your motion to vacate.

Come on up, Mr. Sinchegarcia. You will be sworn, you can tell us why you think the judgment should be

	Proceedings 22
1	vacated. Counsel can cross-examine if he chooses.
2	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I am sorry, your Honor. Can
3	I grab that?
4	THE COURT: Sure.
5	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Okay.
6	XAVIER SINCHEGARCIA, was duly sworn.
7	COURT OFFICER: Please state your name and spell
8	it for the record.
9	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Xavier Sinchegarcia.
10	X-A-V-I-E-R S-I-N-C-H-E-G-A-R-C-I-A.
11	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You can have a
12	seat. And again, refresh my memory. Has this gone to
13	sheriff's sale?
14	MR. YODER: No, your Honor, a sheriff's sale has
15	been requested and presently scheduled for June 11.
16	THE COURT: Mr. Sinchegarcia, let me just ask
17	you a couple of questions. I may have asked you this
18	before, and I apologize if I have.
19	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, sir.
20	THE COURT: The address of the property is what?
21	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: 110 62nd Street, West New
22	York.
23	THE COURT: Where do you live now?
24	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: The same.
25	THE COURT: In the subject property?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes.

THE COURT: How many units is that property, one-family or two-family?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Two-family unit.

THE COURT: Would you agree that at least from a threshold perspective notwithstanding what I do with this motion, that this is a case that is eligible for the mediation program if all things are equal?

MR. YODER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And again I have to apologize if I have gone over this with you, stop me, and I am going to hear you on this motion. Regardless of what I do with the motion, even if I granted it and vacate the final judgment because you are an owner occupier of the property and because it is a two-family, you are eligible for the foreclosure mediation program.

I am going to take a minute to go over that with you. A foreclosure mediation program was announced on October the 16th, 2008, and it really went into effect on January 5th, 2009. It really deals with right now all foreclosure cases up to the sheriff's sale, so since you haven't gone to sheriff's sale yet, you are eligible for this program. I will give it to you and you don't have to fill out these forms if you don't want, but I strongly suggest that you do.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the forms that I am going to give you there are two very important -- in fact, I will give you the forms right now.

You are going to see, Mr. Sinchegarcia, a phone number on the first page there. That is a toll free number. It is an 888 number. That is a number you can call and be steered to a housing counselor who will sit down with you -- in Hudson County who will sit down with you and go over with you whatever income you have and whatever other assets you may have. You may have to fill out a documentation in there called a financial worksheet. There is a document, it might be the last page, but it is captioned "financial worksheet." And the housing counselor will go over with you and assist you in filling out that financial worksheet and will mail it, if one is completed, down to Trenton. A copy of it will be sent to the lender, to the plaintiff here, and a mediation session will be scheduled and the hope in the mediation is that you can reach an agreement with the plaintiff to recast, modify, the loan so that you can stay in your home.

If you don't fill out the worksheet there is no mediation. That is a requirement for the program.

Regardless of what I do with this motion, if I grant it or deny it, you are still eligible for the program.

So my strong advice to you is when we are done here today, regardless of what I do with this motion, you call that number, steer it to a housing counselor, fill out the worksheet with the housing counselor and then I can tell you that as of -- I believe it is June 15th, I don't know if this has been announced yet, but I have become aware of it. Regarding mediations, they are going to require that all forms, meaning worksheets, be completed with the housing counsel and the reason for that has become apparent to us.

I am going to digresses for a minute, if you don't mind. There has been a problem with worksheets that have been completed solely by homeowners without the assistance of a housing counselor, that they don't include either enough information, correct information, and are not, is not supported by the appropriate documents. Tax returns, whatever, bank statements.

I believe as of June 15th there will be a requirement that these forms, these requests be completed with a housing counselor and at that time an actual request be made through the housing counselor for mediation.

That is a little bit of a heads up to you. I think there will be a formal announcement and it could change. This is a very fluid situation. We are trying to do the best we can with this program, but I believe you are

going to see that.

And it makes sense to me, and based upon our experience so far, five or six months into the program, that is one of the issues that is out there. So look for that announcement on the website near you.

MR. YODER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: So back to you.

So fill it out and avail yourself of the program because, quite frankly, even if I vacate the judgment, the foreclosure doesn't go away. There is still this issue regarding what is going to happen.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I understand, your Honor. Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So you have been notified. Tell us what it is — strike that.

Tell us why this Court should vacate final judgment in this matter.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I have a copy of the response paper they presented.

THE COURT: All right. And I assume that you have that, as well?

MR. YODER: Yes.

THE COURT: I think in order to make a record, Carey, we should start marking these documents. So if you would be kind enough, mark that D-1 for us, please.

say was served, you?

notes here. Were you working? Were you employed on May 17

25

25

then?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: On the second floor, your

20

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: He is black and he is much

21

22

taller.

THE COURT: What about the other gentleman who was living in your apartment?

23 24

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Others, yes. Easily. They are -- most of them were Spanish. But not that specific

22

23

19

THE COURT: All right. And who is that person?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Griselle DelaCruz.

THE COURT: Griselle?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Griselle is his first name?

THE COURT: It is a fellow?

24

25

THE COURT: Now, when was the first time you are saying you saw the summons and complaint?

24

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: From the plaintiff, no, your

Honor. From the mortgage companies, yes. 1 2 THE COURT: That's what I mean, and I apologize for that. You did receive a notice? 3 4 MR. SINCHEGARCIA: From the mortgage company that I am late on my payments, that I need to pay. 5 THE COURT: Did you receive a notice of intent 6 to foreclose? Do you remember receiving that type of 7 8 document? 9 MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I don't --10 THE COURT: Before May 17th. 11 MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I couldn't tell you, your Honor. I was waiting to be served. Then I received --12 13 THE COURT: I am sorry for interrupting you, but you just said something that is interesting to me. You 14 15. said you were waiting to be served. 16 What gave you the impression that you were going 17 to be served with a summons and complaint? 18 MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I am trying to modify my loan. I was trying to sell deed in lieu. I was trying to 19 20 also do, when you sell the house, short sale. 21 THE COURT: Right. 22 MR. SINCHEGARCIA: So I am making myself aware of all these things and they are telling me you are not 23 24 under foreclosure yet, you will be soon. I am talking to

the mortgage companies, I am talking to the lady, a friend

25

So I went to Trenton because it is public property, you can get your file.

THE COURT: Right.

25

23

21

THE COURT: Okay. Let me put the service issue

THE COURT: Yes. I want to make sure, and it is helpful to counsel, as well, to know what to cross-examine you on. So?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: We have failure to serve the notice of intent, failure to serve the summons and complaint. What else?

I take it there is a problem that you raise and, again, I am trying to help as I read your certification, that none of these -- and I am just quoting you, quoting you, Page 2 of your certification in bold type underlined in pertinent part, quote, none of the assignments show the named plaintiff to be the owner of the rights, title and interest under the date -- as of the date of foreclosure complaint.

Is that another --

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, your Honor. I didn't sign anything with U.S. Bank, and all the paperwork I got from the plaintiffs before today said U.S. Bank and I was questioning the assignments. I never received any copies.

THE COURT: This Court has held, and I should know this and I don't know if plaintiffs, plaintiff is aware of this, but this Court has held in prior cases that there are various ways to show standing in a foreclosure matter. Having a financial interest in the matter is sufficient in this Court's opinion. Very low threshold for standard in this state.

So the fact that the assignment was not executed prior to the filing of the Complaint, this Court has held

in prior cases is not fatal on the issue of standing because, A, it is such a low threshold in this state and, secondly, having a financial interest in the matter is enough in this Court's opinion to meet that threshold of standard.

So I am not -- you don't know me and I certainly don't know you and I am not trying to circumvent or short circuit any of your arguments, but I am a fairly direct person and I don't like there to be surprises, so I am letting you know and plaintiffs know that that issue, based upon prior rulings, has not been successful.

So let me know what else besides the assignment not showing that the plaintiff was the owner of the property as of the date of the foreclosure.

What else?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Well, maybe it is part of that, but the, the amount. The whole loan itself.

I don't have any paperwork, the assignment paperwork. Then they could technically change the amount, put a different amount.

THE COURT: Forgetting what they could have done, subsequent to May 17 of 2008, did you receive paperwork from the plaintiffs or the lenders indicating a final judgment was going to be entered and the amounts and all that?

THE COURT: I am not trying to short circuit your argument, but I am trying to focus and frame it so

24

action?

	Sinchegarcia - Direct 43
1	A. Notification to what?
2	Q. You stated that you received notice that didn't
3	come from my office, it came directly from the bank
4	regarding late payments, that you were behind?
5	A. I received that I was late on my mortgage
6	payment, yes.
7	Q. What date, do you remember?
8	A. The regular monthly statements from the mortgage
9	companies.
10	Q. Did you receive a letter in March of 2008 that
11	was entitled Notice of Intent to Foreclose?
12	A. No. I do not no. Because I wasn't aware of
.13	anything happening. You said March?
14	Q. It was sent in March, yes.
15	A. I was not aware of something happening in March?
16	THE COURT: Do you want to mark it P-1?
17	MR. YODER: Yes, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Mark it P-1, please.
19	(Notice of Intent to Foreclose, was marked as
20	Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 for Identification.)
21	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Can I
22	THE COURT: Let the document finish being
23	marked.
24	He is trying to detach it. You may have a copy of it

25 there, but even if you do, I want it marked.

		Sinchegarcia - Direct 44
1	Q.	Do you have a copy of our opposition motion?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q.	The document I am referencing is attached as
4	Exhibit D	for ID. D as in David.
5		MR. YODER: There are four pages.
6		THE COURT: Marked P-1.
7		MR. YODER: I don't know if Mr. Sinchegarcia has
8	it.	
9		May I approach?
10		THE COURT: Yes. You don't have to ask.
11	Q.	I hand you what has been marked Plaintiff's
12	Exhibit 1	for Identification. This was the letter that I
13	reference	i.
14		Can you please tell me what it is labeled at the
15	top.	
16	Α.	Notice of Intention to Foreclosure.
17	Q.	And what was the address that it was sent to?
18	A.	110 62nd Street.
19	Q.	And that is your address, correct?
20	Α.	Correct.
21	Q.	And it is made it was sent to your attention?
22	Α.	Yes.
23	Q.	And
24		THE COURT: What is the date of it, sir?
25		MR. SINCHEGARCIA: March 17.

THE COURT: And I don't want to couch a question like could it have been one of the documents, but could this have been one of the documents that lead you to believe that, A, you were behind and, B, how much you owed since this tells you those things? This document tells you

24

-	Sinchegarcia - Direct 46
1	you are behind and that you owe as of April 16th
2	\$11,989.66?
3	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Your Honor, your question is
4	could I confuse that with the one
5	THE COURT: Yes.
6	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: No.
7	THE COURT: Why?
8	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Because the statements, they
9	are always the same. They always look the same. They are
10	like a bill with a little stub on the end to pay and you
11	miss so and so amounts and then late charge, and I received
12	two of them. I have two mortgages.
13	THE COURT: This does indicate a late charge and
14	does indicate a total delinquency and all that, at least.
15	This doesn't have a stub or payment coupon.
16	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: That is why I knew I didn't
17	receive it because you can tell right away the difference
18	in that bill, looking at the thing that I get every month,
19	and that.
20	THE COURT: And the document, okay. Go ahead.
21	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: And those bills don't say
22	notice to foreclosure or anything like that.
23	THE COURT: Okay. By the way
24	MR. YODER: If I may address that, as well.
25	THE COURT: Well, if I might, P-1 is actually a

two-page document. You just gave an extra copy. You said four pages.

MR. YODER: Four pages, your Honor. That's what I wanted to touch on, the NJ Fair Foreclosure Act required the notice be mailed certified mail and that is simply the requirement. Here the lender chose to mail it both certified mail and regular mail.

THE COURT: I understand that. You are not a witness, though. Do you have proof that that was done by virtue of these exhibits?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  YODER: Not by virtue of the exhibits. I can produce a certification.

THE COURT: Okay, you will have to do that, obviously.

Okay. Go ahead.

DIRECT EXAMINATION: (Continued)

- Q. Mr. Sinchegarcia, you admitted -- you say that you were living at the property in May of 2008.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. But you said that you were not the person served with the summons and complaint?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. The summons and complaint states it was served on a male approximately age 27, height 5 foot 9, weight 170 pounds, skin color light or Latino. Hair color brown.

In May of 2008, was there any other individual living at the property address that fits that description?

- A. The only thing that I can tell you is that there were Hispanics around my height living at that -- yeah, I guess the answer would be yes. My roommates were Spanish, around my age, yes.
  - Q. And they were living with you in your apartment?
  - A. Correct, my house.

MR. YODER: I am referring to what has been previously marked Defendant's Exhibit 1, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

- Q. Mr. Sinchegarcia, are you aware that the New
  Jersey court rules permit service upon a competent
  household member residing at the property address age 18 or
  over?
- MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I dispute that. I don't know if that is a fact.

THE COURT: Well, that is my call as opposed to the witness's call.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  SINCHEGARCIA: As far as I am aware I am supposed to --

THE COURT: Listen, in fairness, D-1 indicates that this witness was served personally, so it doesn't say it was left with an adult over the age of 18. It says Mr. Sinchegarcia was served personally.

Whether or not someone at the subject property identified himself as the defendant for the purposes of expediency or just say I will take it and signed his name, I have no idea.

MR. YODER: Your Honor, the process servers do not ask the individual being served to sign, they fill that out themselves as to -- with information that they receive or, if no information is provided, what they believe.

- Q. So from this description you are saying that one of your roommates at the time or your roommate at the time would generally fit this description, as well?
- A. I could tell you that I didn't receive anything and I could tell you that I had roommates that look Spanish and are around my age. That's all I can tell you.

THE COURT: That look Spanish and are around your age?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Right. I could also say that -- I don't want to speak for anybody, but if they would have received anything they would have maybe let me know, hopefully.

- Q. Mr. Sinchegarcia, you stated that you had sent correspondence or a letter to my office?
- A. When I started to be aware of the process of foreclosure, yes.
  - Q. And that letter was sent in January of 2009?

Sinchegarcia - Direct 1 A. Okay. That sounds correct. 2 MR. YODER: Your Honor, can I have this marked 3 P-2 for Identification. (Letter dated January 12, 2009, was marked as 4 Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 for Identification.) 5 6 0. Mr. Sinchegarcia, I am handing to you what has been marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 for identification. 7 this the letter that you sent to my office? 8 9 A. (Perusing) Yes. And can you tell me what the date on that letter 10 0. 11 is? 12 Α. January 12th. And in that letter, in that letter do you notify 13 my office that you have not been served with a summons and 14 complaint? Α. In that letter you were requesting you be given the 45 days mentioned under Section 6 of the Fair Foreclosure Act, correct? Α. Correct. So this letter would have been in response to Q.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the fair, the Section 6 Fair Foreclosure Act letter that my office sent to you?

This letter was in response to me going to A. Trenton seeing what was in the file.

THE COURT: Can I see P-2.

(Witness handing to Court.)

THE COURT: Thanks.

(Perusing document.)

THE COURT: Okay, thanks.

Go ahead, Mr. Yoder.

- Q. Okay. You stated that you sent the letter after going to Trenton, correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And that was after you had done research on the issue of foreclosure action?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. In that research it indicated that you needed to be served with a summons and complaint, correct?
- A. That was the first thing that I knew to do. I am not a lawyer, I educated myself through libraries and whoever offered help to me.

I don't recall specifically. I found out that I have 30 days to respond to my summons. So I don't believe, I am pretty sure that I was not aware at that time that I had 30 days and you didn't serve me properly. I don't believe I was aware at that time of that.

That was what I was aware of at that time (indicating.)

Q. And your statement is prior to seeing is this

Sinchegarcia - Direct letter you had not received any documents from my office? 2 A. Correct. 3 Did you receive a response from my office to 4 your letter? 5 I am pretty sure after that we started Α. back and forth different types of mail, yes. 6 7 MR. YODER: Your Honor, if I could have this 8 marked as Plaintiff's 3. (Letter dated January 27, 2009, was marked as 10 P-3 for Identification.) I am handing you what's been marked as P-3 for Q. Identification. Is this the letter that you received from my office? A. Yes. Q. What is the date on that letter? Α. The 27th. THE COURT: Of? MR. SINCHEGARCIA: January 27, 2009. And in that letter it states that your request for the 45-day extension under the fair foreclosure act was denied since your letter had been received after final judgment had already been entered, correct?

23 Α.

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

Along with that, you provided no reasonable 0. evidence of an ability to reinstate your loan, correct?

That's correct.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

- A. That's what the letter says here.
- Right. Had you provided any proof of an ability Q. to reinstate?
  - A. I wasn't given the opportunity to provide.
- In your previous letter dated January 2009 requesting the 45-day extension, did you include any proof of an ability to reinstate?
  - Α. When I sent that letter, no.
- Along with the letter from my office, did you Q. receive any documents with that?
  - A. "Documents," meaning?
- Specifically the letter references that it was Q. attached to the letter, was a copy of the note, mortgage and assignment in this case.
- A. The copy of the note, mortgage and assignment is when I received this package. That is the only time I received, and I believe this is -- I forget the terminology, counteract everything I am saying now.

THE COURT: In opposition?

- MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Opposition. That is the only time I received a copy of the note, mortgage.
- How did you know to file your motion to vacate Q. final judgment?
  - A. Excuse me?
  - Q. How did you know to file a motion to --

٥.

- A. I did research on my own.
- Q. And the case law cited in your motion, where did you obtain that research?
  - A. Libraries.
  - Q. So you obtained your answer --
  - A. To what specifically?

Everything is what I obtained through library, research, internet, on my own. Nothing is one specific source or, per se, book.

- Q. Is it fair to say you obtained the information contained in your motion from things you read on the internet?
  - A. And libraries.
- Q. It has been brought to my attention you -- it said when you sent your letter to my office dated January 12 requesting the 45-day extension of time, you had not previously received any information from my office?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. But in your letter it specifically states in Paragraph 2 that this letter is in reply to your recently received letter of this week, correct? Second paragraph, first sentence.
- A. Okay. Like I said, everything happened -- I have the -- when I went to Trenton, that's where I based everything on my information. In that package is where

copies of stuff that you sent is --

THE COURT: You are very specific in the second paragraph about having received a letter from them and we are trying to figure out what letter that is. I don't get the impression from reading that letter that it was something you just saw in a file, but rather --

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: No, your Honor, but what I am saying is whatever letter I am talking about, it doesn't say what I previously tried to state, the summons. The summons already happened at that point.

THE COURT: That is not the point. The point is you said you hadn't received any letter from plaintiff's attorney by a certain date, yet in that letter that counsel is asking about you reference a prior letter and we are trying to figure out what letter you are talking about.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Well, whatever motion was sent before this, whether it was the motion to final vacate --

THE COURT: That would be your motion, not that there is --

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: No, the motion to -- the last before this is when everything started, when I became aware of it.

THE COURT: I am just wondering, and it was a question I asked before and you said you hadn't received

	II
	Sinchegarcia - Direct 56
1	any information from plaintiff's attorney about entering
2	final judgment and I am just trying to figure out, one of
3	the letters that you received was the notice from the
4	plaintiff that final judgment was going to be entered and
5	this is the amount. And I don't know whether it is
6	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Your Honor, this is January
7	12.
8	THE COURT: When was final judgment entered?
9	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I went to Trenton in December
10	which is after the fact that I wrote this letter January
11	12. I am not specifically sure I can find the time.
12	THE COURT: When was final judgment entered, Mr.
13	Yoder?
14	MR. YODER: Final judgment was entered on
15	December 30th, 2008.
16	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Okay. And I wrote the
17	letter. Then, yes, that is the letter I am talking about,
18	which is the
19	THE COURT: What letter?
20	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: The final judgment letter.
21	THE COURT: That wouldn't be a letter, it would
22	be a judgment.
23	MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I received whatever I
24	received from them is what I was responding to.

THE COURT: I am trying to figure out what is

1 the letter.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: They sent me a letter saying there is going to be final judgment.

THE COURT: That is what I was getting at a moment ago.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: But that letter wasn't sent until January or December.

when you said you had received a letter the week prior. It you are telling me now that you received a notice from the plaintiff that final judgment is going to be entered soon, chances are that letter included the amount due and, if that's so, then you had an opportunity to contest the amount due when you received the letter and you didn't. There are consequences to these notices being sent out and you are taking no action.

You are asking me now to undo what was done. The plaintiffs are saying they went through the process correctly and you just didn't respond. You are telling me you didn't receive notices and that's why the letter is kind of important.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Your Honor, I did not receive -- what I am saying, your Honor, I did not get summoned, personally summoned, and I was not aware --

THE COURT: I understand.

THE WITNESS: And the first time I was aware of everything, that was after Trenton, after I received that letter, final judgment which by that time I had already lost my right for thirty days in court.

THE COURT: All I am suggesting to you, if the amount due letter was the letter that you received, your opportunity to contest the amount due arose at that time and you are unable to tell me -- strike that.

Do you even have a copy of that letter? You reference the letter, in that letter that you have, P-3.

Do you have a copy of the letter? You obviously received it since you referenced it.

Wouldn't necessarily be in their file, maybe it is, but I am more interested in what might be in your file than in their file.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I don't believe I have it with me, your Honor. But I can tell you that that letter that we, that you showed earlier was not part of it.

THE COURT: Which letter now? I want to be specific.

The notice of intent? Notice would be something different.

There are no numbers, no breakdown of final numbers you owe this month?

You can't tell me what you received. How do you

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Because, your Honor, that is something --

THE COURT: I am not talking about the notice to inform, of intent to foreclose. That would have been sent prior to the notice of summons and complaint being served. I am talking about a document sent out by plaintiff, their attorney, before final judgment was entered alerting you to the amounts that they were, that would be included in the final judgment. That's what I am talking about.

How can you tell me that if you don't know what you received?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Because I remember a letter, your Honor.

THE COURT: What did the letter say?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: My point, your Honor, is that the letter said -- it did not include any numbers.

THE COURT: I am asking you what it said, not what it didn't say.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I don't believe I have a copy of that, your Honor. I have one, I don't believe I have it with me.

THE COURT: Is there a reason why it wouldn't be included with all the other paperwork you brought to court today?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I thought that everything might be here, your Honor, honestly.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Yoder, go ahead.

So I can get to the issue I am focusing on, do you have a document you would like to mark regarding the amount?

MR. YODER: My understanding, your Honor, is that since this was a default with no answer filed, the notation of the entry of default along with notice pursuant to Section 6 of the Fair Foreclosure Act would be sent to Mr. Sinchegarcia allowing our office to then submit final judgment to the Court.

THE COURT: Do you have that document?

MR. YODER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mark it P-4.

MR. YODER: Notice of entry of default and also notice pursuant to Section 6 of the Fair Foreclosure Act.

(Notice of Entry of Default and Notice Pursuant to Section 6 of the Fair Foreclosure Act, was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 for Identification.)

Q. Mr. Sinchegarcia, I will hand you what's been marked Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 for Identification. Have you ever seen this? Is this the letter you are saying that you received --

A. No.

Q. -- that you responded to?

A. It is not.

Q. The -- in your letter of January you state that you are disputing the debt and request all documents upon which the movant will rely at the time of the hearing.

What hearing were you referring to in your letter when you say you are disputing --

- A. I am sorry?
- Q. My last question was, in your letter, when you say you were disputing the debt and requesting all documents upon which the movants will rely at the time of the hearing, which hearing were you referring to?
- A. I was I guess referring to a hearing such as this.
  - Q. So it would be the final judgment?
  - A. Right.

THE COURT: Can -- may I see the document?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, your Honor. (Handing.)

Q. In your letter of January 12 you specifically state that in the second paragraph, first sentence, this letter is reply to your recently received letter of this week.

The first paragraph references that you were requesting your 45-day extension under the fair foreclosure act. The letter which has just been provided you marked as

٦ |

Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 is specifically notice pursuant to Section 6 of the Fair Foreclosure Act advising you of your right to a 45-day extension.

So your letter dated January 12th was in reference to this letter from my office, correct?

- A. Was it in reference to this letter? No.
- Q. It was in response to receiving this notice advising you that you have a right to 45-day extension?
  - A. Right, but the dates don't -- this is August 7.
  - Q. I believe that letter was sent July 7?

    THE COURT: July 7.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: And I did not -- I didn't get this.

- Q. Do you have --
- A. I can't tell you. How can I show you proof that I didn't get this? You can't show me proof that I got this. I didn't get this. The reason why I say I didn't get this, because this would let me know something was going on.

THE COURT: Well, I have to be candid with you. The problem I am having is, the one letter you did claim you received you don't have a copy of with you, today at least, and the reason we know you received it is because you referenced it in one of the letters that you sent to plaintiff's counsel. So it becomes problematic with you

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

receiving letters and not receiving letters when, in a letter that you -- that we know you received because you said it, you don't have.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I understand, your Honor.

- Q. And you said you do receive your mail at this address, correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. And what is the address listed on that letter?
  - A. 110 62nd Street.
  - Q. And that is the property where you live?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. This letter was sent both regular and certified mail. Did you receive either?
- A. Absolutely not. I have not received certified mail. Certified mail you got to sign for. I have not signed or received anything like that. Ever.
  - Q. Did you reject or return anything to sender?
  - A. Never. Absolutely not.
  - Q. Because my office did not receive -
    THE COURT: I don't want you to become a
- witness, Mr. Yoder.

MR. YODER: Yes, your Honor.

Q. When you sent your letter of January 12 you said that was after going to Trenton and finding out that final judgment has been entered and, as you alleged, had not been

1 served with a summons and complaint.

A. Yes.

- Q. Yet your letter of January 12 makes no mention of the entry of judgment.
  - A. Entry of judgment?
  - Q. Of final judgment.
  - A. Okay.
  - Q. It makes no mention of --
- A. When I went to Trenton they told me that's what was happening. They have a group of they take your file and they send it to some attorneys to review it. That's what, that's where it was in the process and it was right before, it was in the summer. After the fact when I received the letter which I can't provide is where I responded to this.
  - Q. When in December did you go to Trenton?
- A. Has to be late December. I mean, I signed in so I can prove I was there.
  - Q. Before Christmas?
- A. It was right around Christmas. I can't tell you specifically on or before. But I know I signed in, so I can show proof that I was there.
- Q. And you waited another two and a half weeks before sending a letter to my office?
  - A. And then I waited while I was doing my research.

I was trying to make myself aware what was going on. I did not receive a letter from you guys, so I was trying to see what was the next step.

- Q. But that letter makes no mention of not having been served with a summons and complaint, correct?
  - A. My letter?
- Q. Correct. You advised -- you stated you went to Trenton and did research.
  - A. Right.
- Q. And you were aware that you needed to be served with a summons and complaint.
- A. I didn't say I was aware at that time. I went over that before.
- Q. But you had previously stated that you were waiting to be served?
  - A. Right.
  - Q. So you were aware you needed to be served?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And when you went to Trenton and found out the foreclosure action had been filed and was pending, and as you claim not been served with the foreclosure summons and complaint, you didn't think it was important to send a letter to my office stating that you had not been served? Instead you sent this letter dated January 12 that makes no mention of not being served the summons and complaint,

simply requesting an additional 45 days in order to

reinstate.

A.

Okay.

MR. YODER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else you want to say, sir, on redirect?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I never feel honestly, your Honor, that I had an opportunity. I am just asking, like you said, these procedures and formalities, they were my rights.

I didn't get served. I didn't have the opportunity to go up to court and say whatever it is I need to, could say.

THE COURT: What would you say if I vacated the final judgment as far as the underlaying mortgage?

Let's assume for the sake of this question I grant your motion, final judgment is vacated, this is your opportunity to respond to this mortgage foreclosure action.

What would you say? We are not talking about not being served, because we are past that. This is your opportunity -- if I were to grant the motion I would expect from you a responsive pleading pursuant to court rule that contests this mortgage foreclosure action.

What would you tell me?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I would say that I can make

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Your inability and the reason of the

the mortgage payments and that I should be allowed the opportunity to keep my house and making the mortgage payments, that my falling short of those payments was a little, was due to a personal hardship, a divorce, which is well overwith, and I can make my payments now.

THE COURT: Again, being as direct with you as I can be --

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Your Honor, I am sorry I have been taking -- I beg your forgiveness.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: This is a lot of information and it is specific to my case, so you are asking me what would I say.

THE COURT: What would you say?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I don't have an answer because I don't have a point, you understand what I am saying? No research of what exactly I can say.

THE COURT: Although, if one is not properly served the issue of a meritorious defense doesn't come into play because lack of jurisdiction is lack of jurisdiction. But, you would have to file a responsive pleading and I have to say to you I am not here to give you advice, but what you just told my isn't a responsive pleading.

\_

inability to pay the mortgage is not pursuant to 464.1. A responsive pleading does not contest the validity of the mortgage. It explains away your failure to pay.

What you are telling me now and your willingness to try to recast this loan and modify it or whatever, whatever accommodation you would try to make, really is appropriate under this mediation program. That is really what the mediation program is meant to do.

And I am not -- first of all, I am not ruling that I am granting the motion, number one, I just asked you a question. I am not ruling on it one way or the other right now.

But don't tell me in the responsive pleading that you are going to be back looking at a default judgment because I will strike the answer.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Your Honor, and my answer to you, your Honor, is I haven't gotten to that point yet.

THE COURT: I got to be honest with you. You filed this motion in February and I know because of extenuating circumstances we have carried it to allow certain matters to ripen, including this notarization issue, but I would have thought that sometime in January or February you would have been thinking about what you were going to say or what you would include in your responsive pleading if I permitted it.

I am having a little bit of difficulty given the nature of the documents that you have submitted to me, the pleadings and the brief and the certification and all that, having a little difficult accepting that you haven't given it any thought.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Your Honor, again, I tried to explain myself. Of course I have given it thought, but where I am getting my information from, I just try to go specifically step by step trying to make myself aware of that stuff preparing myself for the step, and if I am granted that opportunity, that day in court, I will prepare myself for that day in court, specifically what is going on in the court.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else you want to say to me?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am not cutting you off, I just wanted to be as candid with you as I possibly could be.

And based upon what you have told me, and I don't know what caused you to veer off from telling me the reasons for your inability to pay the mortgage and telling me that you really hadn't thought about what your responsive pleading was going to be, yet in response to my question you told me—— I strongly urge you to avail yourself of the mediation program because whether or not I grant your motion, you

should participate in the mediation program. The mediation program doesn't go away if I grant the motion. On the contrary. If I deny the motion, the mediation doesn't go away, or your eligibility for it.

Don't think if I grant the motion you can't to mediation. In fact, in contested cases it is mandatory. So I am trying toy-nobody is trying to trick you here.

Nobody is waiting for you to give the wrong answer and then pounce on you and say ah-ha, you didn't tell me the right thing.

That's not how I conduct my court. I am asking you direct questions, and I expect honest answers. I am not suggesting you haven't been honest, but I expect honest, direct answers to my questions.

So this isn't a game. It is too important to be a game. I will rule how ever I am going to rule, but this isn't a game.

The mediation program is there. Based upon what you told me, it is taylor made for this situation. It is not going away.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: No matter what I do, I am going to -- obviously I am going to try for the mediation program.

Anything else that you want to say to me?
MR. SINCHEGARCIA: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: You can step down.

I want to mark these in evidence. I assume you want to move them into evidence?

MR. YODER: Yes.

THE COURT: P-1 through 4. Do you want your items in evidence, too?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes.

(Above-mentioned exhibits marked into Evidence.)

THE COURT: Not that I am trying to create more work, but I am trying to get, based upon the testimony I heard, a final submission from you on this motion and from you, sir, also, Mr. Sinchegarcia. And I would like it to be simultaneously submitted, meaning I don't want the defendant first and then the plaintiffs.

Just submit them on the same day. When do you think you can get something to me?

MR. BERNHEIM: When would you like it?

THE COURT: Next week. About a week from today, June the 3rd.

MR. YODER: All right.

THE COURT: Mr. Sinchegarcia, based upon your testimony today -- and if you want to submit something else to me in support of your motion I want it a week from today, June third. Send a copy to your adversary and then I will turn it around quickly.

I know we have a sheriff's sale scheduled for the 11th of June, and I have to say — and this is really — this is extremely important. Again, I am not sending out any messages here, mixed or otherwise. No matter what I do, if I grant the motion obviously the sheriff's sale is put off. If I deny the motion, I still want this homeowner to avail himself of the mediation program which would most likely result in the sheriff's sale being adjourned.

Just so that you understand you have to -- and again, this is regardless of what happens with this motion -- call that phone number on the top of that sheet I gave you so that you can be put together with the housing counselor.

Listen, you want to save your home, true?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The mediation program is put into existence so that homeowners can save their homes. That's why it is there. It is not automatic, but that's why it is there. So don't lose site of the big picture here.

Big picture here is to save your home if it can happen. So please avail yourself. It is -- the program is not going away no matter what I do with this motion. But I do want, in fairness to me, final submissions a week from today.

You don't have to, Mr. Sinchegarcia. No one is

-- I am not requiring you to do it, I am not requiring it from the plaintiff, either. If I don't get anything I will go with what I have.

But I do want an opportunity to give the parties an opportunity for one final submission, and here is how I will rule. Most likely very soon after the 3rd.

A member of my staff will give plaintiff's counsel's firm -- will give you a call and give you a call and say the judge is going to render his decision on such and such a day at such and such a time. You will get at least 24 hours' notice, probably much more. You can come in and watch and listen or you can call in.

If both sides call in, you have to organize a conference called and then call in, okay?

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Yes, your Honor.

almost guarantee it will be before June 11. I don't want that sheriff's sale hanging over here without a resolution on this motion and then depending on what happens, like I said, the sheriff's sale may have to get put off in any event, but I want the parties to know what my ruling is, so I want to move accordingly.

MR. HALLINAN: Does anything prevent Mr. Sinchegarcia from applying to the program before your ruling?

THE COURT: No.

today?

MR. HALLINAN: So he could apply for the program

THE COURT: Well, he can call that number, be referred to a housing counselor, meet with a housing counselor and fill out those documents and have the documents sent down to the AOC, down to Trenton right away, and thank you for pointing that out.

Nothing prevents you from today starting the process to apply for the mediation program. You don't have to wait for my ruling on the motion.

Like I said, regardless of how I rule this isn't going away because if I grant your motion I am going to say now I want you to file a responsive pleading within ten days or so, or if I deny your motion you are going to be looking at a sheriff's sale, but you are still are eligible for the mediation program, so nothing prevents you from doing that today.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: I understand, your Honor.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  YODER: The defendants have the statutory two adjournments.

THE COURT: He hasn't availed himself?

MR. YODER: No.

THE COURT: You have the right to go to the sheriff without looking to me and adjourn the sheriff's

sale twice just by going to the sheriff and telling them, telling the sheriff you want an adjournment of the sheriff's sale. You can go there and ask for the adjournment and they have to give it to you. Twice. So don't forget that.

I just don't want this case and this home to be sold or most homes I know are going back to the plaintiffs. I don't want to have a situation where you lose track of this, that would make me upset, and that it gets sold at a sheriff's sale even if it goes back to the plaintiff.

I am giving you a lot of information, but you are obviously an intelligent young man and I assume you are processing it. You will hear from me before the 11th.

MR. SINCHEGARCIA: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: And listen, thank you again. I appreciate your patience and, again, I know my words were received and message sent and received on this.

Again I speak for myself. I am not speaking for the conference. I am speaking for myself in this case, but I do appreciate the efforts that were made to correct that issue.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  YODER: And we appreciate that, your Honor.

(Whereupon, the case is adjourned.)

## CERTIFICATION

I, CAREYANN SHAFTAN, License Number 30X100192900, an official Court Reporter in and for the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify the foregoing to be prepared in full compliance with the current Transcript Format for Judicial Proceedings and is a true and accurate non-compressed transcript to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Official Court Reporter

Hudson County Courthouse

august 21,20