#NewJerseyUNIQUE ALERT #2

ATTN: Federal and State Judges in all jurisdictions

It is more than fitting that an Ohio court should become the breaking ground for a critical component in #FRAUDclosure litigation. After all, it was Federal Judge Christopher A. Boyko's 2007 decision in Deutsche Bank cases that exposed #RoboSigningPart1 and some its ugly relatives.
http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/15/business/15lend.html?ex=1352869200&en=edfdca8937b762a2&ei=5124&partner=permalink&exprod=permalink&_r=0

[#RoboSigningPart2 is A/K/A #DEEP6FRAUDclosure, a quasi-Ponzi scheme.]

Fast forward to December 3, 2015. US Bank v. George returns partial sanity to the #FRAUDclosure process ! (Ohio Court of Appeals, Tenth District No. 14AP-817) The Court dismantled the absurd "reasoning" that homeowners lack the standing to challenge lenders and the purported "assignments", etc., that are still pervasive in #FRAUDclosure litigation, to this very day.

"{¶ 25} We believe that at least one of the underlying cases relied on by the court in Locke has been clarified to the point that its premise as we surmised it no longer supports what we previously held in Locke denying standing to non-privity challengers of note and mortgage transfers and assignments. We thus extend our holding in Pasqualone to clarify that ***standing broadly exists for persons to challenge the validity of the transfer of a note or assignment of the mortgage, whether or not in privity with the person entitled to enforce the note or mortgage,*** *regardless of whether or not the note has been negotiated and transferred under R.C. Chapter 13, Ohio's codification of the Uniform Commercial Code.* (page 12) [Emphasis added]

Bravo ! Bravo ! Bravo !

Prepared by Whistleblower Carolyn Bailey. Posted January 11, 2016
www.HurtingHomeOwners.com
www.Twitter.com/HurtinHomeOwner