




# California Real Estate Finance





**California Real Estate Finance**  
**Fourth Edition**

**Roger Bernhardt**  
PROFESSOR OF LAW  
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY

**Stephen W. Dyer**  
HORAN, LLOYD, KARACHALE, DYER,  
SCHWARTZ, LAW & COOK  
MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

**Edward H. Rabin**  
PROFESSOR OF LAW, EMERITUS  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS  
Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2004  
Roger Bernhardt, Stephen W. Dyer, and Edward H. Rabin  
All Rights Reserved.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Bernhardt, Roger.

California real estate finance / by Roger Bernhardt, Stephen w. Dyer,  
Edward H. Rabin.—4th ed.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-89089-535-X

1. Mortgages—California. 2. Real estate investment—Finance—Law and  
legislation—California. 3. Real estate business—Law and legislation—California.

I. Dyer, Stephen W. II. Rabin, Edward H., 1937– III. Title.

KFC175.A7B47 2003  
346.79404'364—dc22

2003065297

**CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS**  
700 Kent Street  
Durham, NC 27701  
Telephone (919) 489-7486  
Fax (919) 493-5668  
[www.cap-press.com](http://www.cap-press.com)

Printed in the United States of America

*To Christine, who actually handles all the matters I just talk about.*

*R.B.*

*To Cindy for her love and support, and to my colleagues for encouraging me  
to teach.*


*S.W.D.*

*To Jane, who made it all worthwhile.*

*E.H.R.*

*And to all of the debtors and creditors and judges whose mistreatment  
of one another has kept the bar so fully occupied.*

*The Authors*



# Contents

---

Table of Cases	xv
Table of Reprinted Statutes	xxvii
Preface	xxix
Why this course?	xxix
Starr v. Mooslin	xxix
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction and Overview</b>	<b>3</b>
The Advantages of Being a Secured Lender	3
The Mortgage	4
Definitions	4
Some History	4
The Equity of Redemption, Foreclosure and Moratoria	4
Goodenow v. Ewer	4
McMillan v. Richards	8
The Deed of Trust	10
Koch v. Briggs	10
Bank of Italy v. Bentley	12
The Secured Obligation	16
Obligations That Can Be Secured by a Deed of Trust	17
Alternative Financing Arrangements	18
The Security	19
Real Property vs. Personal Property	19
Partial Real Estate Interests	20
Junior and Senior Liens	21
Deficiency Judgments	22
The Routine Foreclosure under California Law	23
Nonjudicial Foreclosure	23
Judicial Foreclosure	25
Federal Foreclosure Procedures	25

## PART I: DEBTOR PROTECTIONS

<b>Chapter 2 The One-Action Rule</b>	<b>29</b>
A. The Basic Rules	29

Code of Civil Procedure 744	29
Code of Civil Procedure 726	29
Western Fuel Co. v. S. G. Lewald Co.	30
Barbieri v. Ramelli	31
Savings Bank v. Central Market Co.	37
Salter v. Ulrich	41
B. Sanctions for Violating the Rule	42
Walker v. Community Bank	42
Security Pacific National Bank v. Wozab	48
Shin v. Superior Court	58
<b>Chapter 3 The Anti-Deficiency Rules</b>	<b>65</b>
A. The Statutes	65
Code of Civil Procedure Section 580a	65
Code of Civil Procedure Section 580b	66
Code of Civil Procedure Section 580d	66
B. The Basic Cases	66
Brown v. Jensen	66
Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino	70
Spangler v. Memel	77
DeBerard Properties v. Lim	84
C. Nonqualifying Juniors	91
Citrus State Bank v. McKendrick	91
Simon v. Superior Court	95
D. Rival Rules	98
Carter v. Derwinski	98
E. Getting Around the Rules	103
1. Changing vendors into lenders	103
Kistler v. Vasi	103
2. Unsecured and undersecured notes	105
Van Vleck Realty v. Gaunt	105
Loretz v. Cal-Coast Dev. Corp.	107
<b>Chapter 4 Other Debtor Protections</b>	<b>111</b>
A. Consumer Protection Legislation	111
B. Usury	116
1. Policy Considerations	116
2. Some Basic Statutes and Regulations	117
Code Of Federal Regulations	117
Constitution Of The State of California	118
California Civil Code	118
3. Loans Made or Arranged by a Person Licensed as a Real Estate Broker, and Secured by Real Property	119
Del Mar v. Caspe	119
4. Penalties for Violating the Usury Laws	127
C. Homesteads	127
D. Bankruptcy Protection	129

11 USC §362(a) & (h)	129
In Re Kinney	130
In re Weisman	132
Bankruptcy Code Section 362(d)	136
In re Arnold & Baker Farms	137

**PART II: SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS OTHER THAN  
MORTGAGES AND DEEDS OF TRUST**

<b>Chapter 5 Equitable Mortgages</b>	145
A. Deeds Absolute	145
Todd v. Todd	145
Wehle v. Price	149
B. Leases and Leasebacks	151
Earp v. Earp	151
In re San Francisco Industrial Park, Inc.	153
C. Negative Pledges.	160
1. Covenants Not to Convey	161
Coast Bank v. Minderhout	161
Tahoe National Bank v. Phillips	162
2. Holding Agreements	167
Kaiser Industries Corp. v. Taylor	167
D. Irregular Mortgages	169
E. Vendors' Liens	171
Brown v. Johnson	171
 <b>Chapter 6 Ground Leases</b>	 175
A. Purposes of the Ground Lease	175
B. Mortgaging the Ground Lease	176
Wells Fargo Bank, N. A. v. Bank of America NT&SA	177
Glendale Federal Bank v. Hadden	181
Valley Investments, L.P. v. Bancamerica Commercial Corporation	184

**PART III: LENDERS' STRATEGIES FOR GAINING ADDITIONAL PROTECTION**

<b>Chapter 7 Rents as Security</b>	191
A. In the Absence of a Specific Clause in the Deed of Trust	191
Excerpts from Code of Civil Procedure Section 564	192
B. The Effect of an Assignment of Rents Clause	196
In re GOCO Realty Fund I	197
 <b>Chapter 8 Damage Awards, Insurance Proceeds and Condemnation Awards as Supplemental Sources of Repayment</b>	 211
Los Angeles Trust & Savings Bank v. Bortenstein	211
Schoolcraft v. Ross	213

Dept. of Transportation v. Redwood Baseline, Ltd.	217
<b>Chapter 9 Lenders' Actions for Waste, Fraud and Negligence</b>	229
Cornelison v. Kornbluth	229
<b>Chapter 10 Guarantors</b>	247
A. True Guaranties	247
Heckes v. Sapp	248
Union Bank v. Gradsky	251
Mariners Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Neil	256
B. Sham Guaranties	262
River Bank America v. Diller	262
C. Hidden Guaranties	265
Mead v. Sanwa Bank California	265
<b>Chapter 11 Multiple Security</b>	269
A. Blanket Liens	269
1. Order of Sale	269
Commonwealth Land Title Company v. Kornbluth	270
2. Releasing Parcels from the Blanket Lien	275
Yackey v. Pacifica Development Co.	275
B. Fair Value and Anti-Deficiency Protection	281
Dreyfuss v. Union Bank of California	281
C. Deficiency Judgments	286
Freedland v. Greco	286
D. Mixed Security	290
Florio v. Lau	290
<b>Chapter 12 Miscellaneous Lender Strategies</b>	305
A. Opinion Letters	305
B. Arbitration	306
Flores v. Transamerica Homefirst	306
C. Avoiding the Full Credit Bid Rule	309

#### **PART IV: PRIORITY AND ALTERATION OF PRIORITY**

<b>Chapter 13 Priorities</b>	317
A. Initial Determinants of Priority	317
1. Recording Act Priority	317
Schelling v. Thomas	317
Far West Savings and Loan Association v. McLaughlin	320
Caito v. United California Bank	323
2. Purchase Money Priority	326
Walley v. P.M.C. Inv. Co.	327
Brock v. First South Savings Ass'n	328
3. Priority of Unrecorded Mortgages Against Other Interests	331
Livingston v. Rice	331

B. The Effect of Foreclosure	333
1. The Effect on Junior and Senior Liens	333
2. The Effect on Leases	333
3. The Effect on Other Interests	335
4. Merger	335
C. After-Acquired Property, Fixtures and Mezzanines	337
1. Enlarging the Mortgaged Property	337
2. Competing Claimants to Fixtures	339
3. “Mezzanine” Financing	341
D. Priority Protected by Title Insurance	343
Cale v. Transamerica Title Insurance	344
<b>Chapter 14 Alteration of Priorities</b>	<b>349</b>
A. The Effect of Statutes of Limitations	349
B. Waiver and Estoppel	350
James v. P.C.S. Ginning Co.	350
Valley Title Co. v. Parish Egg Basket, Inc.	352
C. Loan Modifications	355
Lennar Northeast Partners v. Buice	355
D. Equitable Subrogation	360
E. Consent to Lower	
Priority: Subordination	363
Handy v. Gordon	363
Protective Equity Trust #83, Ltd v. Bybee	367
F. Using Subordination, Nondisturbance and Attornment Agreements	374
Miscione v. Barton Development Company	374
G. Future Advances	380
Civil Code 2884	380
Turner v. Lytton Sav. & Loan Assn.	381
H. Mechanics’ Liens	384

## PART V: EVENTS OF DEFAULT AND ENFORCEMENT BY THE LENDER

<b>Chapter 15 Payment of the Loan</b>	<b>389</b>
A. What is Timely Payment?	389
B. The Effect of Receiving Timely Payment	390
C. Impound Accounts	391
D. Prepayment Clauses	392
Gutzi Associates v. Switzer	392
E. Late Charges	404
Garrett v. Coast & Southern Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn.	404
Ridgley v. Topa Thrift and Loan Association	409
<b>Chapter 16 Defaults and Workouts</b>	<b>415</b>
A. Events of Default	415
Hauger v. Gates	415
Sutherland v. Barclays American Mortgage Corporation	421
B. Acceleration Clauses	427
C. Junior Responses to Senior Defaults	429

Windt v. Covert	429
D. Alternatives to Foreclosure	431
1. Workouts	431
Auerbach v. Great Western Bank	432
2. Deeds in Lieu of Foreclosure	439
Hamud v. Hawthorne	439
Guam Hakubotan, Inc., v. Furusawa Investment Corp.	442
De Martin v. Phelan	448
E. Attorney's Fees	452

## PART VI: THE FORECLOSURE PROCESS

<b>Chapter 17 Pre-Sale Activity</b>	459
A. Preliminary Considerations	459
1. Choice of Remedy	459
Garfinkle v. Superior Court	460
2. Statutes of Limitation	469
Aguilar v. Bocci	469
3. Creditor Disagreements	474
Perkins v. Chad Development Corp.	474
B. Residential Debtor Protection Legislation	477
1. Restrictions on Debt Collectors	477
2. Home Equity Sales Contracts and Foreclosure Consultants	478
C. Judicial Foreclosure: Pre-Sale	479
Goodenow v. Ewer	479
Code of Civil Procedure Section 726	482
Frates v. Sears	483
D. Nonjudicial Foreclosure: Pre-Sale	488
1. The Notice of Default (the "NOD")	488
Excerpts from the Civil Code regulating procedure before the trustee's sale:	488
2. Reinstating the Obligation	497
Excerpts from Civil Code §2924c	497
Gaffney v. Downey Savings and Loan Association	499
Hunt v. Smyth	506
Bisno v. Sax	510
<b>Chapter 18 The Sale and After</b>	515
A. The Foreclosure Sale	515
1. The Notice of Sale (the "NOS")	515
2. Postponement of the Sale	519
South Bay Building Enterprises, Inc. v. Riviera Lend-Lease, Inc.	519
3. Conduct of the Sale	526
Excerpts from the Civil Code Regulating Trustee Sales	526
Nomellini Constr. Co. v. Modesto Sav. & Loan Assn.	529
Lo v. Jensen	535
4. Disposition of the Surplus	537

B. The Fair Value Hearing	539
Code of Civil Procedure 726:	539
<b>Chapter 19 Contesting Foreclosure and Redemption</b>	<b>545</b>
A. Attacks on Foreclosure	545
1. Presale Attacks	545
Jessen v. Keystone Savings & Loan Assn.	545
In re Duncombe	549
2. Post Sale Attacks	553
Sorenson v. Hall	553
BFP v. Resolution Trust Corporation	562
Munger v. Moore	569
B. Post Sale Redemption	573
1. The Statutory Right of Redemption	573
Dyer, Judicial Foreclosure After the Revised	
Enforcement of Judgment Act	575
United States v. Stadium Apartments, Inc.	578
2. The Right to Possession During the	
Redemption Period	588
CCP 564(b)	588
Carpenter v. Hamilton	589
Harris v. Foster	590

**PART VII: LENDER'S COMMITMENT TO LEND, AND  
BORROWER'S COMMITMENT TO PROVIDE SECURITY**

<b>Chapter 20 Lender's Commitment to Lend or</b>	
<b>    Pay Liens on the Borrower's Property</b>	<b>597</b>
A. Lender's Commitment to Make a Loan	597
First Nat'l State Bank of New Jersey v. Commonwealth	
Federal Sav. & Loan Ass'n of Norristown	597
B. Lender's Commitment to Make	
Additional Loans (Future Advances)	605
Civil Code 2884	605
Tapia v. DeMartini	606
Atkinson v. Foote	606
Langerman v. Puritan Dining Room Co.	609
C. Lender's Commitment to Repay Existing Loans	
(All Inclusive Deeds of Trust)	612
FPCI Re-Hab 01 v. E & G Investments, Ltd.	612
<b>Chapter 21 Borrower's Commitment to Furnish Additional Security,</b>	
<b>    or to Have Existing Security Secure Additional Debts</b>	
<b>    (Dragnet Clauses)</b>	<b>617</b>
Gates v. Crocker-Anglo Nat. Bank	617
Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Ass'n	620
Union Bank v. Wendland	624

### PART VIII: TRANSFERS OF THE PROPERTY OR THE DEBT

<b>Chapter 22</b>	<b>Transfers by the Mortgagor</b>	631
A.	Assumption (and Nonassumption) of the Mortgage	631
	Hopkins v. Warner	631
	Robson v. O'Toole	633
	Braun v. Crew	637
B.	Assumption and Deficiency Protection	640
	LaForgia v. Kolsky	641
C.	Assumption and Due on Sale Clauses	646
	Wellenkamp v. Bank of America	646
	The Impact of Federal Legislation (the Garn Act)	653
D.	Nonbankruptcy Treatment of Fraudulent Conveyances	656
	Wyzard v. Goller	656
<b>Chapter 23</b>	<b>Transfers by the Mortgagee</b>	659
A.	Payor—Transferee Disputes	663
	Rodgers v. Peckham	663
	Wilson v. Steele	669
B.	Transferee—Transferee Disputes	677
	Adler v. Newell	677
	In re Executive Growth Investments, Inc.	682

### PART IX: LAND SALE CONTRACTS

<b>Chapter 24</b>	<b>Installment Land Contracts</b>	693
A.	Vendors' Problems	693
	Glock v. Howard & Wilson Colony Co.	693
	Venable v. Harmon	699
	Barkis v. Scott	701
	MacFadden v. Walker	703
	Petersen v. Hartell	705
	Freedman v. The Rector	713
	Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp.	717
	Smith v. Allen	721
B.	Purchasers' Problems	725
	Lloyd v. Locke-Paddon Land Co.	725
	Lurette v. Bank of Italy National Trust & Savings Ass'n.	728
	Kent v. Clark	730
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>European Mortgage Law</b>	735
A.	Construction of Loan Documents in Seville	735
B.	Forfeitures in Venice	736
<b>Index</b>		745

# Table of Cases

---

\* indicates principal cases

- A & M Produce Co. v. FMC Corp. (1982) 135 Cal.App.3d 473, 307
- A.J. Lane & Co., In re, 113 B.R. 821 (Bankruptcy Court, D. Massachusetts, 1990), 400
- Abdallah v. United Savings Bank, 43 Cal App. 4th 1101 (1996), 455
- Adams v. Department of Motor Vehicles, 11 Cal. 3d 146 (1974), 463
- \*Adler v. Newell, 109 Cal. 42 (1895), 677
- Affiliated Foods, In re, 249 B.R. 770 (Mo., 2000), 137
- Affordable Housing Development Corp., In re, 175 B.R. 324 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1994), 568, 571
- Affordable Housing Development Corp., In re, 175 B.R. 324 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1994), 568, 571
- \*Aguilar v. Bocci, 39 Cal. App. 3d 475 (1974), 469
- Alaska State Bank v. Fairco, 674 P.2d 228 (Alaska, 1983), 426
- Alexander v. Angel, 37 Cal. 2d 856 (1951), 645
- Alexander v. Security First National Bank, 7 Cal. 2d 718 (1936), 216
- ALH Holding Company v. Bank of Telluride, 18 P.3d 742 (Colo. 2000), 327–328
- Alhambra Redev. Agency v. Transamerica Fin. Services, 212 Cal. App. 3d 1370 (1989), 724
- Alliance Mortgage Company v. Rothwell, 10 Cal. 4th 1226 (1995), 310
- American Realty Trust v. United States, 498 F.2d 1194 (4th Cir. 1974), 156
- American Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Leeds, 68 Cal. 2d 611 (1968), 239
- American Sec. Life v. Harris Trust & Sav. Bank (N.D. Ill. 1994) 859 F.Supp. 1163, 1165, 236
- Anderson v. Heart Federal S&L, 208 Cal. App. 3d 202 (1989), 495
- Anderson v. United Finance Co., 666 F.2d 1274 (9th Cir. 1982), 259
- Angell v. Superior Court, 73 Cal. App. 4th 691 (1999), 533, 558
- Angell v. Superior Court, 73 Cal. App. 4th 691 (1999), 533, 558
- Angels, Inc. v. Stuart-Wright Mortgage, Inc., 85 Cal. App. 4th 1279 (2001), 558
- Anglo-California Bank v. Cerf, 147 Cal. 384 (1905), 609
- Anglo-Californian Bank, Ltd. v. Field, 146 Cal. 644 (1905), 188
- Aplanalp v. Forte, 225 Cal.App.3d 609 (1990), 58, 421
- Appel v. Hubbard, 155 Cal. App. 2d 639 (1957), 479
- Armendariz v. Foundation Health Psychcare Services, Inc. (2000) 24 Cal.4th 83, 9 Cal.Rptr.2d 745, 6 P.3d 669, 307
- Armsey v. Channel Associates, Inc., 184 Cal.App.3d 833 (1986), 614
- Arnold & Baker Farms, In re, 85 F.3d 1415 (9th Cir. 1996), 137
- Arnolds Management Corp. v. Eischen, 158 Cal. App. 3d 575 (1984), 560
- Arrow Sand & Gravel v. Superior Court, 38 Cal. 3d 884 (1985), 557
- Aruba Bonaire Curacao Trust Co. v. United California Bank, 32 Cal. App. 3d 281 (1973), 255
- Aspen Enterprises, Inc. v. Bodge, 37 Cal. App. 4th 1811 (1995), 301
- Assets Realization Co. v. Clark, 205 N.Y. 105 (1912), 667
- Associates Nat. Mtg. Corp. v. Farmers Ins. Exch., 217 Cal. App. 3d 562 (1990), 290
- \*Atkinson v. Foote, 44 Cal. App. 149 (1919), 606
- \*Auerbach v. Great Western Bank, 74 Cal.App.4th 1172 (1999), 432
- Avery v. Clark, 87 Cal. 619 (1891), 331
- Baffa v. Johnson, 35 Cal. 2d 36 (1950), 702
- Baldwin v. American Trading Co., 76 Cal. App. 80 (1925), 444
- Ballengee v. Sadlier, 179 Cal. App. 3d 1 (1986), 533
- Bank of America Assn. v. Reidy (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 243, 248, 535

- Bank of America v. Daily (1984) 152 Cal.App.3d 767, 48
- Bank of America v. Graves, 51 Cal App 4th 607 (1996), 38
- Bank of America v. Hirsch Mfg. Co., 64 Cal. App. 2d 175 (1944), 379
- Bank of America v. Quackenbush, 56 Cal. App. 4th 1167 (1997), 313
- Bank of America v. Quackenbush, 56 Cal. App. 4th 1167 (1997), 313
- Bank of California v. Leone, 37 Cal. App. 3d 444 (1974), 19
- Bank of Hemet v. United States, 643 F.2d 661 (9th Cir. 1981), 575
- \*Bank of Italy v. Bentley, 217 Cal. 644 (1933), 12
- Bank of Italy v. MacGill (1928) 93 Cal. App. 228, 353
- Bank of Mendocino v. Baker, 82 Cal. 114 (1889), 326
- Bank of Napa v. Godfrey, 77 Cal. 612 (1888), 428
- Bank of Seoul v. Marcione, 198 Cal. App. 3d 113 (1988), 534
- Bank of Ukiah v. Petaluma Sav. Bank, 100 Cal. 590, 591, 332
- Bank of Woodland v. Heron, 120 Cal. 614 (1898), 200
- Banta v. Rosaco, 12 Cal. App. 2d 420 (1936), 633
- Barberi v. Rothschild, 7 Cal. 2d 537 (1936), 337, 577
- Barbieri v. Ramelli, 84 Cal. 154 (1890), 31
- Bargioni v. Hill, 59 Cal. 2d 121 (1963), 75
- Barisch v. Lewis, 226 Cal. App. 3d 12 (1990), 335
- \*Barkis v. Scott, 34 Cal. 2d 116 (1949), 700–701
- Baron v. Colonial Mortgage Service Co., 111 Cal. App. 3d 316 (1980), 531
- Barrera v. Security Building & Investment Corp, 519 F.2d 1166 (5th Cir. 1975), 24
- Bartold v. Glendale Federal Bank, 81 Cal. App. 4th 816 (2000), 391
- Bateman v. Burr, 57 Cal. 480, 462
- Bauman v. Castle, 15 Cal. App. 3d 991 (1971), 254
- Baypoint Mortgage v. Crest Premium Real Estate Inv. Retirement Trust, 168 Cal. App. 3d 818 (1985), 408, 419
- Bechtel v. Weir, 152 Cal. 443 (1907), 561
- Beeler v. American Trust Co., 24 Cal. 2d 1 (1944), 444, 451
- Behrendt v. Abraham, 64 Cal. 2d 182 (1966), 716
- Bell Silver & Copper Mining Co. v. First National Bank, 156 U.S. 470 (1895), 23
- Benham v. Rowe, 2 Cal. 337 (1852), 573
- Bennett v. Bourne, 5 S.W.3d 124 (Ky. 1999), 477
- Benson v. Patella, 362 S.E.2d 217 (Ga. 1987), 510
- Bertschman v. Covell, 205 Cal. 707 (1928), 537
- BFP v. Imperial S&L., 132 B.R. 748 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1991), 525
- \*BFP v. Resolution Trust Corporation, 511 U.S. 531 (1994), 562
- Birkhofer v. Krumm, 27 Cal. App. 2d 513 (1938), 417
- Birkhofer v. Krumm, 4 Cal. App. 2d 43, 48–50 (1935), 417, 635
- Birman v. Loeb, 64 Cal. App. 4th 502 (1998), 421
- \*Bisno v. Sax, 175 Cal. App. 2d 714 (1959), 429, 510
- Bisno v. Sax, 175 Cal. App. 2d 714 (1959), 429, 510
- Blair v. Pitchess, 5 Cal. 3d 258 (1971), 196
- Block v. Tobin, 45 Cal. App. 3d 214 (1975), 537, 571
- Blockey v. Fowler, 21 Cal. 326 (1863), 573
- Blood v. Munn, 155 Cal. 2286, 274
- Board of Trustees v. Ren-Cen Indoor Tennis Club, 377 N.W.2d 432 (Mich. App. 1985), 628
- Bolton v. Logan, 30 Cal. App. 2d 30 (1938), 487
- Bothin v. The California Title Ins. Co. (1908) 153 Cal. 718, 723, 322
- Boye v. Boerner, 38 Cal. App. 2d 567, 332
- Bradbury v. Davenport (I), 114 Cal. 593 (1896), 444
- Bradbury v. Davenport (II), 120 Cal. 152 (1898), 444–445
- Bratcher v. Buckner, 90 Cal. App. 4th 1177 (2001), 373
- \*Braun v. Crew, 183 Cal. 728 (1920), 266, 637
- Bridges v. Cal-Pacific Leasing Co., 16 Cal. App. 3d 118 (1972), 341
- \*Brock v. First South Savings Ass'n, 8 Cal. App. 4th 661 (1992), 328
- Brophy v. Downey, 67 P.312 (Mont. 1902), 40
- Brown v. Campbell, 100 Cal. 635 (1893), 538
- Brown v. Copp, 105 Cal. App. 2d 1 (1951), 537
- \*Brown v. Jensen, 41 Cal. 2d 193 (1953), 66
- \*Brown v. Johnson, 98 Cal. App. 3d 844 (1979), 171
- Bruntz v. Alfaro, 212 Cal. App. 3d 411 (1989), 456
- Buck v. Barb, 147 Cal. App. 3d 920 (1983), 455
- Buck v. Dahlgren, 23 Cal. App. 3d 779 (1972), 525
- Budget Realty, Inc. v. Hunter, 157 Cal. App. 3d 511 (1984), 88
- Bull v. Coe, 77 Cal. 54 (1888), 46
- Burr v. Beers, 24 N.Y. 178, 636
- Butner v. United States, 440 U.S. 48 (1979), 198
- C.J.A. Corporation v. Trans-Action Financial Corp., 86 Cal.App.4th 664 (2001), 39–40

- Cadle Co. II v. Harvey, 83 Cal. App. 4th 927 (2000), 265
- \*Caito v. United California Bank, 20 Cal. 3d 694 (1978), 323
- Calamari v. Grace, 469 N.Y.S. 2d 942 (1983), 348
- \*Cale v. Transamerica Title Insurance, 225 Cal.App.3d 422 (1990), 348
- Calero-Toledo v. Pearson Yacht Leasing Company, 416 U.S. 663 (1974), 246
- California. Nedlloyd Lines B.V. v. Superior Court, 3 Cal. 4th 459 (1992), 101
- California Savings & Loan v. Culver, 127 Cal. 107 (1899), 511
- \*Carter v. Derwinski, 987 F.2d 611 (9th Cir. 1992), 98
- Carlson v. J.G. Ruddle Properties, Inc., 2 Cal. 2d 17 (1934), 205
- Carpenter v. Hamilton, 24 Cal. 2d 95 (1944), 589
- Carpentier v. Brenham, 40 Cal. 221 (1870), 484, 669
- Caruso v. Great West Savings, 229 Cal. App. 3d 667 (1991), 290
- Case v. Egan, 57 Cal. App. 453 (1922), 637
- Centofante v. CBJ Development, Inc., 220 B.R. 467 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1996), 137
- Chapman v. Farr, 132 Cal.App.3d 1021, 124
- Charmicor v. Deaner, 572 F.2d 694 (9th Cir. 1978), 465
- Chelios v. Kaye, 219 Cal. App. 3d 75 (1990), 543
- CIC Investment Corp., 175 B.R. 52 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1994), 658
- \*Citrus State Bank v. McKendrick, 215 Cal.App.3d 941 (1989), 91
- Clayton Development Co., Inc. v. Falvey, 206 Cal. App. 3d 438 (1988), 170
- Clermont v. Secured Investment Corp., 25 Cal. App. 3d 766 (1972), 408
- Cline v. Robbins, 112 Cal. 581 (1896), 442
- \*Coast Bank v. Minderhout, 61 Cal. 2d 311 (1964), 161, 647
- Cohen v. Marshall, 197 Cal. 117 (1925), 40
- Cohn v. Cohn, 1 Cal. 2d 313 (1934), 442
- Commercial Centre R.R. Co. v. Superior Ct., 7 Cal. 2d 121, 129 (1936), 467
- Commonwealth Land Title Company v. Kornbluth, 175 Cal. App. 3d 518 (1985), 270
- Commonwealth Mortgage Assurance v. Superior Court, 211 Cal. App. 3d 508 (1989), 259
- Comm'r v. Tufts, 461 U.S. 300 (1983), 646
- Comstock v. Finn, 13 Cal. App. 2d 151 (1936), 474
- Conley v. Matthes, 56 Cal. App. 4th 1453 (1997), 75
- Connolly Development Inc. v. Superior Court, 17 Cal. 3d 803 (1976), 384, 461
- Consolidated Capitol Income Trust v. Khaloghli, 183 Cal. App. 3d 107 (1986), 254
- Continental Securities Corp. v. Shenandoah Nursing Home Partnership, 188 B.R. 205 (District Court, W.D. Virginia, 1995), 397
- Coppola v. Superior Court, 211 Cal. App. 3d 848 (1989), 102, 544
- Copsey v. Sacramento Bank, 133 Cal. 659 (1901), 573
- \*Cornelison v. Kornbluth, 15 Cal. 3d 590 (1975), 229, 645
- Cornell v. Sennes, 18 Cal. App. 3d 126 (1971), 341
- Cornwell v. Bank of America, 224 Cal. App. 3d 995 (1990), 505
- Crane v. Comm'r, 337 U.S. 1 (1947), 646
- Christopherson v. Allen, 190 Cal. App. 2d 848 (1961), 108
- Crookall v. Davis, Punelli, Keathley & Willard, 65 Cal. App. 4th 1078 (1998), 88
- Cuesta, 458 U.S. 141 (1982), 655
- Curry v. Moody, 40 Cal. App. 4th 1547 (1995), 455
- Curtis v. Holee, 184 Cal. 726 (1921), 639
- Dauch v. Ginsburg, 214 Cal. 540 (1931), 338
- Davidow v. Corporation of America, 16 Cal. App. 2d 6, 10–12 (1936), 22
- Dawn Investment Co. v. Superior Court, 30 Cal. 3d 695 (1982), 651
- Days California Riverside Limited Partnership, In re, 27 F.3d 374 (9th Cir. 1994), 196, 208
- \*De Martin v. Phelan, 115 Cal. 538 (1897), 448
- Dealey v. East San Mateo Land Co., 21 Cal. App. 39 (1913), 537
- \*DeBerard v. Lim, 20 Cal. 4th 659 (1999), 84, 482
- \*DeBerard Properties v. Lim, 20 Cal.4th 659 (1999), 84, 482, 646
- \*Del Mar v. Caspe, 222 Cal. App. 3d 1316 (1990), 119
- \*Dept. of Transportation v. Redwood Baseline, Ltd., 84 Cal. App. 3d 662 (1978), 217
- Diamond Benefits Life Ins. Co. v. Troll, 66 Cal. App. 4th 1 (1998), 335
- Diamond Benefits Life Insurance Co. v. Troll, 66 Cal. App. 4th 1 (1998), 488
- Dieden v. Schmidt, 104 Cal. App. 4th 645 (2002), 20
- Dimock v. Emerald Properties, 81 Cal. App. 4th 868 (2000), 497, 560
- DiSalvo, In re, 219 F3d 1035, 62
- DMC, Inc. v. Downey Savings and Loan Ass'n., 99 Cal. App. 4th 190 (2002), 338
- Domarad v. Fisher & Burke, Inc., 270 Cal. App. 2d 543 (1969), 679
- Dominguez, In re, 995 F.2d 883 (9th Cir. 1993), 126

- Donovick v. Seattle-First National Bank, 757 P.2d 1378 (1988), 286
- Dougherty v. 425 Development Assoc., 462 N.Y.S.2d 851 (1983), 495
- Dover Mobile Estates v. Fiber Form Products, Inc., 220 Cal. App. 3d 1494 (1990), 333, 374
- \*Dreyfuss v. Union Bank of California, 24 Cal. 4th 400 (2000), 258, 281
- Droeger v. Friedman, Sloan & Ross, 54 Cal.3d 26 (1991), 258
- Duarte v. Lake Gregory Land & Water Co., 39 Cal. App. 3d 101 (1974), 313
- Duncombe, In re, 143 B.R. 243 (Bkr. Cal. 1992), 549
- Dunn v. Barry, 35 Cal. App. 325 (1917), 428, 511
- Dupnik v. United States, 848 F.2d 1476 (9th Cir. 1988), 588
- \*Earp v. Earp, 231 Cal.App.3d 1008 (1991), 151
- Easebe Enterprises, In re, 900 F.2d 1417 (9th Cir. 1990), 603
- East New York Savings Bank v. Hahn, 326 U.S. 230 (1945.), 7
- Eastland Savings & Loan v. Thornhill & Bruce, Inc., 260 Cal. App. 2d 259 (1968), 208
- Ehring v. Western Community Moneycenter, 900 F.2d 184 (9th Cir. 1990), 568
- Ekmann v. Plumas County Bank, 215 Cal. 671 (1932), 349, 359
- Eldridge v. Burns, 136 Cal. App. 3d 907 (1982), 279
- Eldridge v. Burns, 76 Cal. App. 3d 396, 277, 279
- Elysian Inv. Group, LLC v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co., 105 Cal. App. 4th 315 (2002), 344
- Evans v. California Trailer Court, Inc., 28 Cal. App. 4th 540 (1994), 336
- Everts v. Matteson, 21 Cal. 2d 437 (1946), 645
- Fairfax v. Dime Savings Bank, 544 N.Y.S.2d 826 (1989), 391
- Falmouth Nat'l Bank v. Ticor Title Insurance Co., 920 F.2d 1058 (1st Cir. 1990), 348
- \*Far West Savings and Loan Association v. McLaughlin, 201 Cal. App. 3d 67 (1988), 320
- Faxon v. All Persons, 166 Cal. 707 (1913), 471
- FBW Enterprises v. The Victorio Company, 821 F.2d 1393 (1987), 257
- Federal Land Bank v. Bott, 732 P.2d 710 (1987), 7
- Federal Land Bank v. Story, 756 P.2d 588 (1988), 7
- Federal National Mortgage Assn. v. Levine-Rodriguez, 579 N.Y.S.2d 975 (1991), 322
- Felton v. LeBreton, 92 Cal. 457, (1891), 16
- Felton v. West, 102 Cal. 266 (1894), 33, 63
- Finnell v. Finnell, 156 Cal. 589 (1909), 331
- Firato v. Tuttle, 48 Cal.2d 136 (1957), 241
- First American Title Company v. United States, 848 F.2d 969 (9th Cir. 1988), 517
- First Bank of Idaho v. Stauffer, 730 P.2d 1053 (Ida. App. 1986), 40
- First Commercial Mortgage Co. v. Reece, 108 Cal. Rptr. 23 (2001), 313
- First Commercial Mortgage Co. v. Reece, 108 Cal. Rptr. 23 (2001), 313
- First Fidelity Thrift & Loan Assn. v. Alliance Bank, 60 Cal. App. 4th 1433 (1998), 326
- First Interstate Bank v. Shields, 730 P. 2d 429 (1986), 257
- First Nat'l State Bank of New Jersey v. Commonwealth Federal Sav. & Loan Ass'n of Norristown, 610 F.2d 164 (3rd Cir. 1979), 597
- First National Bank of Moline v. Califf, Harper, Fox & Dailey, 548 N.E.2d 136, 239
- First Nationwide Savings, v. Perry, 11 Cal.App.4th 1657 (1992), 241
- First v. Byrne (1947) 238 Iowa 7122, 618
- First Wyoming Bank v. Mudge, 748 P.2d 713 (1988), 169
- First-Trust Joint Stock Land Bank v Meredith, 5 Cal.2d 214 (1936), 63
- FISBA Forwarding, Inc., In re, 230 B.R. 334 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. 1999), 568
- Flack v. Boland, 11 Cal. 2d 103 (1938), 471
- Flagg Bros., Inc. v. Brooks (1978) 436 U.S. 149, 556
- \*Flores v. Transamerica Homefirst, 93 Cal. App. 4th 846 (2001), 306
- \*Florio v. Lau, 68 Cal App 4th 637 (1998), 290
- Flynn v. Page, 218 Cal. App. 3d 342 (1990), 455
- Fogarty v. Sawyer, 17 Cal. 589 (1861), 9
- Foley v. Interactive Data Corp., 47 Cal. 3d 654 (1988), 425
- Ford v. Manufacturer's Hanover Mortgage, 831 F.2d 1520 (9th Cir. 1987), 217
- Fountain Valley Chateau Blanc Homeowners' Assn. v. Department of Veterans Affairs, 67 Cal. App. 4th 743 (1998), 700
- Fowler v. Lane Mfg. Co., 58 Cal. App. 66 (1922), 592
- FPCI Re-Hab 01 v. E & G Investments, Ltd., 207 Cal. App. 3d 1018 (1989), 612
- Francis v. West Virginia Oil, 174 Cal. 168 (1917), 720
- Frank Lyon Co. v. U.S., 435 U.S. 561 (1978), 157
- \*Frates v. Sears, 144 Cal. 246 (1904), 333,336, 483
- \*Freedland v. Greco (1955) 45 Cal.2d 462, 282
- \*Freedman v. The Rector, 37 Cal. 2d 16 (1951), 511, 713
- Freedom Financial Thrift v. Golden Pacific Bank, 20 Cal. App. 4th 1305 (1993), 509
- Freeman v. Lind, 181 Cal. App. 3d 791 (1986), 215, 420
- French v. Mortgage Guarantee Co., 16 Cal. 2d 26 (1940), 400

- Friery v. Sutter Buttes Savings Bank, 61 Cal. App. 4th 869 (1998), 359
- Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1972), 196
- Fundex Capital Corp. v. Reichard, 568 N.Y.S.2d 794 (1991), 20
- \*Gaffney v. Downey Savings and Loan Association, 200 Cal. App. 3d 1154 (1988), 499
- Garber v. Fullerton Savings and Loan, 122 Cal. App. 3d 423 (1981), 656
- Garcia v. Atmajian, 113 Cal. App. 3d 516 (1980), 724
- \*Garfinkle v. Superior Court, 21 Cal. 3d 268 (1978), 460
- Garretson Investment Co. v. Arndt, 144 Cal. 64 (1904), 17
- \*Garrett v. Coast & Southern Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn., 9 Cal. 3d 731 (1973), 404
- Garrett v. Perry, 53 Cal. 2d 178 (1959), 734
- \*Gates v. Crocker-Anglo Nat. Bank, 257 Cal. App. 2d 857 (1968), 617
- Ghirardo v. Antonioli, 8 Cal. 4th 791 (1994), 126
- Giandeini v. Ramirez, 11 Cal. App. 2d 469 (1936), 34, 40
- Glavinich v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co., 163 Cal. App. 3d 263 (1984), 344
- \*Glendale Federal Bank v. Hadden, 73 Cal. App. 4th 1150 (1999), 181
- \*Glock v. Howard & Wilson Colony Co., 123 Cal. 1 (1898), 693
- Gluskin v. Atlantic Savings & Loan Assn. (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 307, 357-359, 372
- Gluskin v. Lehrfeld, 134 Cal. App. 2d 804 (1955), 733
- Golden State Lanes v. Fox, 232 Cal. App. 2d 135 (1965), 155
- Goldie v. Baucht Properties, 15 Cal. 3d 307 (1975), 341
- Goldwater v. Hibernia Savings & Loan, 19 Cal. App. 511 (1912), 473
- \*Goodenow v. Ewer, 16 Cal. 461 (1860), 4, 479
- Goodyear v. Mack, 159 Cal. App. 3d 654 (1984), 644
- Gottschalk v. Draper Companies, 23 Cal.App.3d 828 (1972), 250
- Grand Avenue Partners v. Goodan, 25 F. Supp.2d 1064 (C.D. Cal., 1996), aff'd 160 F.3d 580 (9th Cir.1998), 181
- Grant v. Burr, 54 Cal. 298 (1880), 472
- Graves v. Arizona Central Bank, 205 Cal. 715 (1928), 446
- Green v. Carlstrom, 212 Cal. App. 2d 240 (1963), 428
- Green v. Rancho Santa Margarita Mortgage Co., 28 Cal. App. 4th 686 (1994), 604
- Green v. Superior Court, 51 Cal. App. 3d 446 (1975), 721
- Greycas v. Proud, 826 F.2d 1560, (7th Cir. 1987), 239
- Griesemer v. Hammond, 18 Cal. App. 535, 727
- Gross v. Superior Court, 171 Cal. App. 3d 265 (1985), 335
- Grupp v. Margolis, 153 Cal. App. 2d 500 (1957), 338
- \*Guam Hakubotan, Inc. v. Furusawa Investment Corp., 947 F.2d 398 (9th Cir. 1991), 442
- Guardian S&L v. MD Assocs., 64 Cal.App.4th 309 (1998), 63, 101
- Guild Mortgage Co. v. Heller, 193 Cal. App. 3d 1505 (1987), 241
- Guttenberg Savings & Loan Assn. v. Rivera, 428 A.2d 1289 (1981), 335
- \*Gutzi Associates v. Switzer, 215 Cal. App. 3d 1636 (1989), 392
- Guyselman v. Ramsey, 179 Cal. App. 2d 802 (1960), 19, 109
- Hager v. Astorg, 145 Cal. 548 (1904), 481
- Hahn v. Hahn, 123 Cal. App. 2d 97 (1954), 4
- Hamel v. Gootkin, 202 Cal. App. 2d 27 (1962), 20, 259
- Hamel v. Gootkin, 202 Cal. App. 2d 27 (1962), 20, 259
- Hammel Radiator Corp. v. Mortgage Guarantee Co., 137 Cal. App. 2d 468 (1933), 338
- Hammond v. Wallace, 85 Cal. 522 (1890), 537
- \*Hamud v. Hawthorne, 52 Cal. 2d 78 (1959), 439
- Han v. U.S., 944 F.2d 26 (9th Cir. 1991), 361
- \*Handy v. Gordon, 65 Cal. 2d 578 (1967), 363
- \*Harris v. Foster, 97 Cal. 292 (1893), 590
- Harris v. Reynolds (1859), 13 Cal. 514, 590
- Hartford Life Ins. Co. v. Randall (1978) 283 Or. 297, 395
- Harvey v. Davis, 69 Cal. 2d 362 (1968), 681
- Hatch v. Collins, 225 Cal. App. 3d 1104 (1990), 524, 533
- Hatch v. Security-First Nat. Bank, (1942) 19 Cal.2d 254, 282
- \*Hauger v. Gates, 42 Cal. 2d 752 (1954), 415, 557
- Hawk v. State Bar, 45 Cal. 3d 589 (1988), 24
- Hawkins v. Oakland Title Insurance and Guaranty Company, 165 Cal. App. 2d 116 (1958), 343
- Hayward Lbr. & Inv. Co. v. Naslund (1932) 125 Cal.App. 34, 670
- \*Heckes v. Sapp, 229 Cal. App. 2d 549 (1964), 248
- Heiman v. Bishop, 272 N.Y. 83 (1936), 543
- Heintz v. Jenkins, 514 U.S. 291 (1995), 477
- Hellweg v. Cassidy, 61 Cal. App. 4th 806 (1998), 338
- Helvering v. Lazarus, 308 U.S. 252 (1939), 157
- Hersch v. Citizens Savings & Loan, 146 Cal. App. 3d 1002 (1983), 426

- Hibernia Sav. v. Thornton, 109 Cal. 427, 37  
Hickman v. Mulder, 58 Cal. App. 3d 900 (1976),  
233  
Hicks v. E.T. Legg Assocs., 89 Cal. App. 4th 496  
(2001), 552  
Hicks v. Legg, 89 Cal. App. 4th 496 (2001), 524,  
552  
Hillen v. Soule, 7 Cal. App. 2d 45, (1935), 68  
Hocking v. Title Insurance & Trust Co., 37 Cal.  
2d 644 (1951), 344  
Hodgkins v. Wright, 127 Cal. 688 (1900), 150  
Holden Land & Live Stock Co. v. Interstate  
Trading Co., 123 P. 733 (1912), 446  
Holiday Inns of America v. Knight, 70 Cal. 2d  
327 (1969), 722  
Home Building & Loan Assn. v. Blaisdell, 290  
U.S. 398 (1934), 7  
Homestead Savings v. Darmiento, 230 Cal. App.  
3d 424 (1991), 556  
\*Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp., 64  
Cal. 2d 801 (1966), 717  
\*Hopkins v. Warner, 109 Cal. 133 (1895), 631  
Hotaling v. Montieth 128 Cal. 556 (1900), 453  
Houston Lumber Co. v. Skaags, 613 P.2d 416  
(N.M., 1980), 360  
\*Hunt v. Smyth, 25 Cal. App. 3d 807 (1972), 506  
Hurt, In re, 158 B.R. 154 (9th Cir. BAP, 1993),  
514  
I.E. Assocs. v. Safeco Title Ins. Co., 39 Cal. 3d  
281 (1985), 493  
In re Crystal Properties, Ltd., L.P., 268 F.3d 743  
(9th Cir. 2001), 428  
In re Duncombe, 143 B.R. 243 (Bkr. Cal. 1992),  
549  
In re GOCO Realty Fund I, 151 B.R. 241  
(Bankr. N.D. Cal. 1993), 197  
Income Realty v. Columbia Sav. & Loan, 661  
P.2d 257 (Colo. 1983), 653  
Indusco Mgmt. Corp. v. Robertson, 40 Cal.  
App. 3d 456 (1974), 255  
Irvine v. Perry, 119 Cal. 352 (1897), 275  
Ito v. Schiller, 213 Cal. 632 (1931), 336  
Jackson v. Taylor, 272 Cal.App.2d 1 (1969), 642  
\*James v. P.C.S. Ginning Co., 276 Cal. App. 2d  
19 (1969), 350  
JEM Enterprises v. Washington Mutual Bank, 99  
Cal. App. 4th 638 (2002), 217  
\*Jessen v. Keystone Savings & Loan Assn., 142  
Cal. App. 3d 454 (1983), 545  
Johns v. Moore, 168 Cal. App. 2d 709 (1959),  
192  
Johnson v. Kaeser (1925) 196 Cal. 686, 423  
Jonathan Manor, Inc. v. Artisan, 247 Cal. App.  
2d 651 (1967), 169  
Jones v. Kallman, 199 Cal.App.3d 131, 124  
Jones v. Sacramento S&L Ass'n., 248 Cal. App.  
2d 522 (1967), 373  
Jordan v. Talbot, 55 Cal. 2d 597 (1961), 721  
Jump v. Barr, 46 Cal. App. 338 (1920), 428  
K.M.C. v. Irving Trust Co., 757 F.2d 752 (6th  
Cir. 1985), 603  
\*Kaiser Industries Corp. v. Taylor, 17 Cal. App.  
3d 346 (1971), 167  
Karl v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co., 20  
Cal. App. 4th 972 (1993), also 60 Cal. App.  
4th 858 (1997), 348  
Karlsen v. American Savings & Loan Assn., 15  
Cal. App. 3d 112 (1971), 560  
Karoutas v. HomeFed Bank, 232 Cal. App. 3d  
767 (1991), 529  
Kartheiser v. Superior Court, 174 Cal. App. 2d  
617 (1959), 512  
Kasdan, Simonds, McIntyre, Epstein & Martin  
v. World Sav. & Loan Ass'n (In re Emery),  
317 F.3d 1064 (2002), 215  
Katsivalis v. Serrano Reconveyance Co., 70 Cal.  
App. 3d 200 (1977), 360, 362  
Keller v. Lewis (1878) 53 Cal. 113, 707  
Kent & Cahoon v. Laffan, 2 Cal. 595 (1852), 573  
\*Kent v. Clark, 20 Cal. 2d 779 (1942), 730  
Kent v. Williams, 146 Cal. 3 (1905), 479  
Kim v. Sumitomo Bank, 17 Cal. App. 4th 974  
(1993), 373  
Kinney, In re, 51 B.R. 840 (C.D.Cal. 1985), 130  
Kinsmith Fin. Corp. v. Gilroy, 105 Cal. App. 4th  
477 (2003), 73  
Kirk v. Source One Mortgage Services Corpora-  
tion, 46 Cal. App. 4th 483, 392  
Kirkpatrick v. Westamerica Bank, 65  
Cal.App.4th 982(1998), 47  
\*Kistler v. Vasi, 71 Cal. 2d 261 (1969), 103  
KMAP, Inc. v. Town & Country Broadcasters,  
49 Cal. App. 3d 544 (1975), 35  
\*Koch v. Briggs, 14 Cal. 256 (1859), 10  
Kogan v. Bergman, 244 Cal. App. 2d 613, 169  
Kolodge v. Boyd, 88 Cal. App. 4th 349 (2001),  
312-313, 336, 555  
Korea Exchange Bank v. Yang, 200 Cal. App. 3d  
1471 (1988), 540  
Kosloff v. Castle (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 369,  
707  
Kreshek v. Sperling, 157 Cal. App. 3d 279  
(1984), 215  
Krohn, In re, 203 Ariz. 205 (2002), 561  
Krueger v. Bank of America, 145 Cal. App. 3d  
204 (1983), 255  
Kruger v. Wells Fargo Bank, 11 Cal. 3d 352  
(1974), 464  
Kudokas v. Balkus, 26 Cal. App. 3d 744 (1972),  
719  
Kurtz v. Calvo, 75 Cal. App. 4th 191 (1999), 105  
La Sala v. American Sav. & Loan Assn. 5 Cal. 3d  
864 (1971), 647  
\*LaForgia v. Kolsky, 196 Cal.App.3d 1103 (1987),  
641-646

- Laks v. Coast Federal S&L, 60 Cal. App. 3d 885 (1976), 602
- Lambert v. Jones, 540 S.W.2d 256 (Tenn. 1976), 280
- Landes Construction Co. v. Royal Bank of Canada, 833 F.2d 1365 (9th Cir. 1987), 603
- Landis v. Bloomquist, 257 Cal. App. 2d 533 (1967), 721
- \*Langerman v. Puritan Dining Room Co., 21 Cal. App. 637 (1913), 609
- Lara, In re, 731 F.2d 1455, 1458–1462, 123–124
- Lavenson v. Standard Soap Co., 80 Cal. 245 (1889), 338, 419
- Lavenson v. Standard Soap Co., 80 Cal. 245 (1889), 338, 419
- Lawrence v. Maloof, 256 Cal. App. 2d 600 (1968), 474
- Lawson v. Smith, 402 F. Supp 851, 463
- Lawyers Title Insurance Corp. v. Feldsher, 42 Cal. App. 4th 41 (1996), 362
- Lazzareschi Inv. Co. v. San Francisco Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn., (1971) 22 Cal.App.3d 303, 395, 396
- Lee v. Joseph, 267 Cal. App. 2d 30 (1968), 669
- \*Lennar Northeast Partners v. Buice, 49 Cal. App. 4th 1576 (1996), 355
- Leroy T. v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 12 Cal.3d 434, 438, 115 Cal.Rptr. 761, 525 P.2d 665, 125
- Leyva v. Superior Court, 164 Cal. App. 3d 462 (1985), 682
- Lezine v. Security Pacific Financial Services, 14 Cal. 4th 56 (1996), 259
- Life Savings Bank v. Wilhelm, 84 Cal. App. 4th 174 (2000), 540
- Liona Corp. v. PCH Associates, 804 F.2d 193 (2d Cir. 1986), 158
- Little v. C.F.S. Service Corp., 188 Cal. App. 3d 1354 (1987), 533, 558
- Little v. U.S., 794 F.2d 484 (9th Cir. 1986), 575
- \*Livingston v. Rice, 131 Cal. App. 2d 1 (1955), 331
- \*Lloyd v. Locke-Paddon Land Co., 5 Cal. App. 2d 211 (1935), 725
- \*Lo v. Jensen, 88 Cal. App. 4th 1093 (2001), 535
- Loeb v. Christie, 6 Cal. 2d 416 (1936), 248
- Lomanto v. Bank of America, 22 Cal. App. 3d 663 (1972), 619
- Long v. Superior Court, 170 Cal. App. 3d 499 (1985), 83
- Longmaid v. Coulter, 123 Cal. 208 (1898), 698
- Lopez v. Bell, 207 Cal. App. 2d 304 (1962), 428
- \*Los Angeles Trust & Savings Bank v. Bortenstein, 47 Cal. App. 421 (1920), 211
- Los Angeles v. Berk, 26 Cal. 3d 201 (1980), 233
- Lovelady v. Bryson Escrow, 27 Cal. App.4th 25 (1994), 170
- Lovett v. Point Loma Dev. Corp., 266 Cal. App. 2d 70 (1968), 205
- Lowe v. Mass. Mutual Life, 54 Cal. App. 3d 718 (1976), 602
- Lucky Investments, Inc. v. Adams, 183 Cal. App. 2d 462 (1960), 643
- Ludy v. Zumwalt (1927) 85 Cal. App. 119, 327
- \*Luette v. Bank of Italy National Trust & Savings Ass'n., 42 F.2d 9 (9th Cir. 1930), 728
- Lumber & Builders Supply Co. v. Ritz, 134 Cal. App. 607 (1933), 380
- Lupertino v. Carbahal, 35 Cal. App. 3d 742 (1973), 495
- Luther Burbank Savings & Loan v. Community Construction, Inc., 64 Cal. App. 4th 652 (1998), 542
- \*MacFadden v. Walker, 5 Cal. 3d 809 (1971), 703
- MacLeod v. Moran, 153 Cal. 97, 14
- Madrid, In re, 725 F.2d 1197(CA9 1984), 566
- Madrid, In re, 725 F.2d 1197, 1199 (CA9 1984), 566
- Majewsky v. Empire Construction Co., Ltd., 2 Cal. 3d 478 (1970), 328
- Manning v. Queen, 263 Cal. App. 2d 672 (1968), 384, 417
- Manning v. Queen, 263 Cal. App. 2d 672 (1968), 384, 417
- Mantle (Dumas v. Mantle), In re, 153 F.3d 1082 (9th Cir 1998), 20
- \*Mariners Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Neil, 22 Cal. App. 3d 232 (1971), 256
- Marino, In re, 193 B.R. 907 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1997), 326
- Martin v. Becker (1915) 169 Cal. 301, 353
- Matter of Clark, 738 F.2d 869 (7th Cir. 1984), 512
- Mayhall v. Eppinger, 137 Cal. 5 (1902), 465
- McCarty v. Mellinkoff, 118 Cal. App. 112 (1931), 400
- McCausland v. Bankers Life Ins. Co. (Wash.1988) 110 Wash.2d 716, 395
- McCulloch v. M&C Beauty Colleges, 194 Cal. App. 3d 1338 (1987), 75
- McDermott v. Burke, 16 Cal. 580 (1860), 593
- McDonald v. Smoke Creek, 209 Cal. 231 (1930), 459
- McKean v. German-Am Savings Bank (1897) 118 Cal 334, 50
- \*McMillan v. Richards, 9 Cal. 365 (1858), 8, 574
- McMillan v. United Mortgage Co., 437 P.2d 878 (Nev. 1968), 40
- \*Mead v. Sanwa Bank, 61 Cal. App. 4th 561 (1998), 265
- Mellor, In re, 734 F.2d 1396 (9th Cir. 1984), 136
- Mercantile Collection Bureau v. Roach (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 355, 327
- Merced Bank v. Casaccia, 103 Cal. 641, 38

- Meyers v. Home Sav. & Loan Assn., 38 Cal. App. 3d 544 (1974), 397
- Meyers v. Home Sav. & Loan, 38 Cal. App. 3d 544 (1974), 397, 409
- Michelson v. Camp, 72 Cal. App. 4th 955 (1999), 312–313
- Middlebrook-Anderson Co. v. Southwest Sav. & Loan Assn. (1971) 18 Cal.App.3d 1023, 369–370
- Miller v. Citizens Sav. & Loan Assn., 248 Cal. App. 2d 655, 371
- Miller v. Federal Land Bank of Spokane, 587 F. 2d 415 (9th Cir. 1978), 227
- Miller v. Provost [26 Cal. App. 4th 1703 (1994), 473
- Mills, In re, 841 F.2d 902 (1988), 236–237
- Milstein v. Security Pac. Nat. Bank, 27 Cal. App. 3d 482 (1972), 214
- Mira Flores Avenue, Coral Gables, Fla., 731 F. Supp. 1563 (S.D. Fla. 1990), 246
- \*Miscione v. Barton Development Company, 52 Cal. App. 4th 1320 (1997), 374
- Mitchell v. W.T. Grant Co., 416 U.S. 600 (1974), 196
- Mitsui Mfrs. Bank v. Superior Court, 212 Cal. App. 3d 726 (1989), 603
- Moeller v. Lien (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 822, 561
- Monterey S.P. Partnership v. W. L. Bangham Inc., 49 Cal. 3d 454 (1989), 12
- Monumental Life Ins. Co. v. Bibo, Inc., 200 B.R. 348 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1996), also 139 F.3d 659(1998), 129
- Moran v. Gardemeyer (1889) 82 Cal. 102, 622
- Morgan v. Reasor Corp., 69 Cal. 2d 881, 894 (1968), 672
- Morosani v. First National Bank of Atlanta, 703 F.2d 1220 (11th Cir. 1983), 604
- Morrison v. Home S&L, 175 Cal. App. 2d 765 (1959), 602
- Mortgage Guarantee Co. v. Sampsell, 51 Cal. App. 2d 180, 290
- Moss v. Minor Properties, 262 Cal. App. 2d 847, 855 (1968), 631
- \*Munger v. Moore, 11 Cal. App. 3d 1 (1970), 569
- Munkelt v. Kumberg, 22 Cal. App. 2d 369 (1937), 592
- Murphy v. Wilson, 153 Cal. App. 2d 132, 569
- National Enterprises, Inc. v. Woods, 94 Cal. App. 4th 1217 (2001), 336
- Nat'l Sav. Bank v. Creswell, 100 U.S. 630 (1880), 273
- Nedlloyd v Superior Court, 3 Cal 4th 459 (1992), 63, 101
- Nelson v. Orosco, 117 Cal. App. 3d 73 (1981), 542
- Nevin v. Salk, 45 Cal. App. 3d 331 (1975), 108
- Newcomb v. City of Newport Beach, 12 Cal. 2d 235 (1938), 442
- Newhouse v. Upchurch, 22 Cal. App. 3d 204 (1971), 705
- Nghiem, In re, 264 B.R. 557 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2001), 525
- Nguyen v. Calhoun, 105 Cal. App. 4th 428 (2003), 389
- Nickerman v. Ryan, 93 Cal. App. 3d 564 (1979), 80
- Nicolopulos v. Superior Court, 106 Cal. App. 4th 304 (2003), 473
- Nippon Credit Bank v. 1333 N. Cal. Blvd., 86 Cal. App. 4th 486 (2001), 236
- Nobelman v. American Savings Bank, 113 U.S. 2106 (1993), 141
- \*Nomellini Constr. Co. v. Modesto Sav. & Loan Assn., 275 Cal. App. 2d 114 (1969), 529
- North Georgia Finishing, Inc. v. Di-Chem, Inc., 419 U.S. 601 (1975), 196
- Northrip v. Federal National Mortgage Association, 527 F.2d 23 (6th Cir. 1975), 24
- Northview Corporation, In re, 130 B.R. 543 (9th Cir. BAP 1991), 208
- Oakland Bank of Savings v. California Pressed Brick Co., 183 Cal. 295 (1920), 337
- Old Colony Trust v. Comm'r, 279 U.S. 716 (1929), 646
- Old Stone Bank v. Tycon I Bldg. Ltd. Partnership, 946 F.2d 271 (4th Cir. 1991), 227
- O'Meara v. DeLamater, 52 Cal. App. 2d 665 (1942), 669
- O'Neil v. General Security Corp. (1992) 4 Cal.App.4th 587, 60
- Onofrio v. Rice, 55 Cal. App. 4th 413 (1997), 478, 560
- Orlando v. Berns, 154 Cal. App. 2d 753 (1957), 150
- Ormond Beach Associates Limited Partnership, In re, 184 F.3d 143 (2nd Cir. 1999), 640
- Ostayan v. Serrano Reconveyance Co., 77 Cal. App. 4th 1411 (2000), 336, 529
- Osuna v. Albertson, 134 Cal. App. 3d 71 (1982), 233
- Pacheco v. Heussler, 390 N.Y.S.2d 761 (1977), 391
- Pacific Inland Bank v. Ainsworth, 41 Cal. App. 4th 277 (1995), 312
- Pacific Loan Mgmt. Corp. v. Superior Court, 196 Cal. App. 3d 1485 (1987), 538
- Pacific S&L v. No. American Co., 37 Cal. App. 2d 307, 309–310 (1936), 12
- Pacific Valley Bank v. Schwenke (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 134, 61
- Page v. Frazier, 445 N.E.2d 145 (1983), 348
- Pajaro Dunes Rental Agency Inc., In re (N.D.Cal.1993) 156 B.R. 263, 61
- Palm v. Schilling (1988) 199 Cal.App.3d 63, 84
- Paradise Land & Cattle Co. v. McWilliams Enterprises, Inc., 959 F.2d 1463 (1992), 265


- Paramount Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Barber, 263 Cal. App. 2d 166 (1968), 643
- Pas v. Hill, 87 Cal. App. 3d 521 (1978), 455
- Passanisi v. Merit-McBride Realtors, 190 Cal. App. 3d 1496 (1987), 455
- Patel v. Khan, 970 P.2d 836 (1998), 485
- Paykar Construction v. Bedrosian, 71 Cal. App. 4th 803 (1999), 73
- Penthouse International v. Dominion Federal S&L, 665 F. Supp. 301 (S.D.N.Y. 1987), reversed 855 F.2d 963 (2d Cir. 1988), 603
- People v. Nogarr, 164 Cal.App.2d 591 (1958), 20, 259
- People v. Whitaker, 13 Cal. App. 4th 1237 (1992), 280
- Perez v. 222 Sutter Street Partners, 222 Cal. App. 3d 938 (199, 335, 494)
- Pergorare v. Wong, 84 Cal. App. 4th 863 (2000), 89
- \*Perkins v. Chad Development Corp., 95 Cal. App. 3d 645 (1979), 474
- \*Petersen v. Hartell, 40 Cal. 3d 102 (1985), 705
- Peterson Dev. Co. v. Torrey Pines Bank, 233 Cal. App. 3d 103 (1991), 603
- Phelan v. De Martin, 85 Cal. 365 (1890), 449
- Phelps, In re, 93 Cal. App. 4th 451 (2001), 478
- Pierce v. Robinson, 13 Cal. 116 (1859), 148
- Pike v. Tuttle, 18 Cal. App. 3d 746 (1971), 356, 380–381
- Pollock v. Tiano, 253 Cal. App. 2d 183 (1967), 366
- Prestige Limited Partnership—Concord, In re, 205 Bank. Rpt. 427 (Bankr., N.D. Cal. 1997), aff'd 164 F.3d 1214 (9th Cir., 1999), 265
- Prestige Ltd. Partnership—Concord v. East Bay Car Wash Partners, 234 F. 3d 1108 (9th Cir. 2000), 89
- Price v. Wells Fargo Bank, 213 Cal. App. 3d 465 (1989), 425
- Principal Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Vars, Pave, McCord & Freedman. 65 Cal. App. 4th 1469 (1998), 379
- \*Protective Equity Trust #83, Ltd. v. Bybee, 2 Cal. App. 4th 139 (1991), 367
- Prudential Ins. Co. v. Spencer's Kenosha Bowl, 404 N.W.2d 109 (1987), 640
- Prunty v. Bank of America, 37 Cal. App. 3d 430 (1974), 89
- Public Servitudes. In Prentice v. Erskine, 164 Cal. 446 (1913), 729
- R. W. Blois Cardoza Co. v. Imperial Bank, 152 Cal. App. 3d 26 (1984), 487
- R.G. Hamilton Corp. v. Corum, 218 Cal. 92 (1933), 417
- Raedeke v. Gibraltar Sav. & Loan Assn. (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 665, 571
- Rainer Mortgage v. Silverwood Ltd., 163 Cal. App. 3d 359 (1985), 540
- Rake v. Wade, 504 U.S. 464, 141
- Randone v. Appellate Dept., 5 Cal. 3d 536 (1971), 196
- Raub v. Lee (1960), 181 Cal. App. 2d 529, 80
- Ray Thomas Enter. v. Fox, 128 Cal. App. 3d 361 (1982), 367
- Redd v. Western Savings & Loan, 646 P.2d 761 (Utah 1982), 651
- Redingler v. Imperial Sav. & Loan Assn., 47 Cal. App. 3d 48 (1975), 289
- Reeder v. Longo, 131 Cal. App. 3d 291 (1982), 365
- Residential Capital, LLC v. Cal-Western Reconveyance Corp., 108 Cal. App. 4th 807 (2003), 559
- Resolution Trust Corporation v. Diamond 18 F.3d 111 (2d Cir. 1994), 335
- Rettner v. Shepherd, 231 Cal. App. 3d 943 (1991), 74
- Richardson v. Suiter, 74 Cal. App. 2d 682 (1946), 4
- Riddle v. Lushing, 203 Cal. App. 2d 8314, 249
- \*Ridgley v. Topa Thrift and Loan Association, 17 Cal. 4th 970 (1998), 409
- \*River Bank America v. Diller, 38 Cal. App. 4th 1400 (1995), 262
- River Bank America v. Diller, 45 Cal. App. 4th 1400 (1995), 250
- Roberts v. Colyear, 179 Cal. 669 (1919), 553
- Robinson v. Russell 24 Cal. 467 (1864), 230
- \*Robson v. O'Toole, 45 Cal. App. 63 (1919), 633
- \*Rodgers v. Peckham, 120 Cal. 238 (1898), 663
- Roes v. Wong, 69 Cal. App. 4th 375 (1999), 127
- Romo v. Stewart Title Co., 35 Cal. App. 4th 1609 (1995), 312
- \*Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino, 59 Cal. 2d 35 (1963), 70
- Rosenberg v. Smidt, 727 P.2d 778 (Alaska 1986), 494
- Rosner v. Worcester, 811 F.2d 1224 (9th Cir. 1987), 561
- Ross v. Title Guarantee & Trust Co., 136 Cal. App. 393 (1934), 676
- Rowley v. Davis, 34 Cal. App. 184 (1917), 172
- R-Ranch Markets v. Old Stone Bank, 16 Cal. App. 4th 1323 (1993), 334
- RTC v. BVS Development, Inc., 42 F.3d 1206 (1994), 359
- Rubin v. Los Angeles Federal S & L, 159 Cal. App. 3d 292 (1984), 655
- Russell v. Roberts (1974) 39 Cal.App.3d 390, 84
- Safeguard Self-Storage Trust, In re, 2 F. 3d 967 (9th Cir. 1993), 207
- Sahadi v. Continental Illinois National Bank, 706 F.2d 193 (7th Cir. 1983), 426

- Sain v. Silvestre, 78 Cal. App. 3d 461 (1978), 335
- Salter v. Ulrich, 22 Cal. 2d 263 (1943), 41
- San Diego Realty v. Hill, 168 Cal. 637 (1914), 481
- San Francisco Industrial Park, Inc., In re, 307 F. Supp. 271 (N.D. Cal. 1969), 153
- San Mateo County Bank v. Dupret, 124 Cal. App. 395 (1932), 417
- San Paolo U.S., Holding Co. v 816 South Figueroa Co., 62 Cal. App. 4th 1010 (1998), 541
- Sanders v. Palmer, 507 N.Y.S.2d 844 (1986), 33, 286
- Sanders v. Palmer, 507 N.Y.S.2d 844 (Ct. App. 1986), 33
- Sanders v. Palmer, 68 N.Y. 2d 180 (1986), 257
- Saucedo v. Mercury Sav. & Loan Assn., 111 Cal. App. 3d 309 (1980), 455
- Savings & Loan Soc. v. Burnett, 106 Cal. 514, 607
- Savings Bank v. Central Market Co., 122 Cal. 28 (1898), 37
- Scalese v. Wong, 84 Cal. App. 4th 863 (2000), 242, 482
- \*Schelling v. Thomas, 96 Cal. App. 682 (1929), 317
- Schiele v. First Natl Bank of Linton, 436 N.W.2d 248 (N.D. 1989), 542
- Schneider v. Ampliflo Corp., 148 Cal. App. 3d 637 (1983), 367
- Schoenberg v. Benner, 251 Cal. App. 2d 154 (1967), 681
- \*Schoolcraft v. Ross, 81 Cal. App. 3d 75 (1978), 213
- Security First National Bank v. Chapman, 31 Cal. App. 2d 182 (1939), 34
- Security First Nat'l Bank v. Lamb, 212 Cal. 64 (1931), 417
- Security Mortgage Co. v. Delfs, 47 Cal. App. 599 (1920), 679
- Security Pacific National Bank v. Casavant, 205 Cal. App. 3d 127 (1988), 76
- \*Security Pacific National Bank v. Wozab, 51 Cal.3d 991 (1990), 48
- Security-First National Bank v. Lamb, 212 Cal. 64 (1931), 383
- Shannon v. Northern Counties Title Ins. Co. 270 Cal. App. 2d 686 (1969), 454
- Sheldon v. La Brea Materials, Co., 216 Cal. 686 (1932), 335
- Shelley v. Byers, 73 Cal. App. 44 (1925), 16
- Shepherd v. Robinson, 128 Cal.App.3d 615 (1981), 643
- Sherwood-Trimble Medical Group v. 10001 Venice Boulevard Partnership, 75 Cal. App. 4th 872, (1999), 302
- \*Shin v. Superior Court, 26 Cal.App.4th 542 (1994), 58
- Shultis v. Woodstock Land Dev. Assoc. (1993) 188 A.D.2d 234, 236–237, 359
- Shumway v. Horizon Credit Corporation, 801 SW2d 890 (Tex. 1991), 5
- Simmons v. Dryer, 216 Cal. App. 2d 7331, 278
- \*Simon v. Superior Court, 4 Cal. App. 4th 63 (1992), 95, 628
- \*Smith v. Allen 68 Cal. 2d 93 (1968), 310, 721
- Smith v. Anglo-California Trust Co., 205 Cal. 496 (1928), 380
- Sniadich v. Family Finance Corp., 395 U.S. 337 (1969), 196
- Snider v. Basinger, 61 Cal. App. 3d 819 (1976), 361, 669
- Snyder v. Western Loan & Building Co., 1 Cal. 2d 697 (1934), 192
- Sohn v. Cal. Pac. Title Ins. Co., 124 Cal. App. 2d 757 (1954), 538
- \*Sorenson v. Hall, 219 Cal. 680 (1934), 553
- \*South Bay Building Enterprises, Inc. v. Riviera Lend-Lease, Inc., 72 Cal. App. 4th 1111 (1999), 519
- Southeast Company, In re, 868 F.2d 335 (9th Cir. 1989), 513
- Southern California Lumber Co. v. Ocean Beach Hotel Co., 94 Cal. 217 (1892), 561
- Southwest Concrete Products v. Gosh Construction Corp., 51 Cal. 3d 701 (1990), 126
- \*Spangler v. Memel, 7 Cal. 3d 603 (1972), 77, 85
- \*Spangler v. Memel, 99 Cal. Rptr. 774 (depublished), 365–366
- Stanton, In re, 303 F.3d 939 (9th Cir. 2002), 381
- \*Starr v. Mooslin, 14 Cal. App. 3d 988 (1971), xxix, 373
- Statewide Savings & Loan Association v. Canoe Hill, 406 N.Y.S.2d 755 (N.Y. 1978), 624
- Stein v. Simpson, 37 Cal. 2d 79 (1951), 362
- Stephens, Partain & Cunningham v. Hollis, 196 Cal. App. 3d 948 (1987), 533
- Stephenson v. Lawn (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 66, 253
- Stewart v. Thelen, 204 Cal. App. 2d 564 (1962), 474
- Stickel v. Harris, 196 Cal.App.3d 575, 584, 122–123, 125
- Stockton Sav. & Loan Bank v. Massanet, 18 Cal. 2d 200 (1941), 645
- Stockton v. Newman, 148 Cal. App. 2d 558 (1957), 546
- Storek & Storek, Inc. v. Citicorp Real Estate, 100 Cal. App. 4th 44 (2002), 424, 432
- Streiff v. Darlington, 9 Cal. 2d 42 (1937), 431
- Strike v. Trans-West Discount Corp., 92 Cal. App. 3d 735 (1979), 336, 363
- Suchy, In re, 786 F.2d 900 (9th Cir. 1986), 557

- Sullivan v. Superior Court, 185 Cal. 133 (1921), 333, 593
- Sumitomo Bank of California v. Iwasaki, 70 Cal.2d 81 (1968), 259
- Sumitomo Bank v. Davis, 4 Cal. App. 4th 1306 (1992), 333
- Summers v. Hallam Cooley Enterprises, 56 Cal. App. 2d 112 (1942), 350
- Sunset Bay Associates, In re, 944 Fed.2d 1503 (9th Cir. 1991), 371–372
- Surety Sav. v. Natl. Auto & Cas. Ins, 8 Cal. App. 3d 752, 549
- \*Sutherland v. Barclays American/Mortgage Corporation, 53 Cal. App. 4th 299 (1997), 421
- Sutro Co. v. Paramount Plastering, Inc., 216 Cal. App. 2d 433 (1963), 333
- Sweatt v. Foreclosure Co. 166 Cal. App. 3d 273 (1985), 452, 499
- Sweatt v. The Foreclosure Co., 166 Cal. App. 3d 273 (1985), 452, 499
- Swiss Property Management Co. v. Southern California IBEW Pension Plan, 60 Cal. App. 4th 839 (1997), 371
- System Investment Corp. v. Union Bank, 21 Cal. App. 3d 137 (1971), 562
- \*Tahoe National Bank v. Phillips, 4 Cal. 3d 11 (1971), 162
- \*Tapia v. DeMartini, 77 Cal. 383 (1888), 606
- Taylor v. Bouissiere, 195 Cal. App. 3d 1197 (1987), 20
- Teachers Ins. & Annuity Ass'n of America v. Butler, 626 F. Supp. 1229 (S.D.N.Y. 1986), 603
- Third Nat'l. Bank v. Impac Limited, 432 U.S. 312 (1976), 549
- Thompson v. Allert, 233 Cal. App. 3d 1462 (1991), 88
- Title Insurance & Trust Co. v. California Development Co., 171 Cal. 173 (1915), 479
- Titus v. Woods, 45 Cal. App. 541 (1920), 250
- Toby v. Oregon B.R. Co., 98 Cal. 490, 38
- \*Todd v. Todd, 164 Cal. 255 (1912), 145
- Tomczack v. Ortega, 240 Cal. App. 2d 902 (1966), 495
- Tome v. Baer, 113 B.R. 626 (Bankr. C.D.Cal., 1990), 525
- Tomlin v. Cole, 152 Cal. App. 3d 556 (1984), 478
- Torrey Pines Bank v. Hoffman (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 308, 263
- Tourny v. Bryan, 66 Cal. App. 426 (1924), 505
- Tower Inv. Co. v. Peoples Bank, 97 Cal. Rptr. 559 (1971), 280
- Townsend v. State Bar, 32 Cal. 2d 592 (1948), 373
- Track Mortgage Group v. Crusader Insurance Co., 98 Cal. App. 4th 857 (2002), 313
- Travelers Ins. Co. v. 633 Third Associates (2d Cir. 1994) 14 F.3d 114, 117–118, 236–237
- Travelli v. Bowman, 150 Cal. 587 (1907), 471
- Trilon Plaza, Inc. v. Comptroller Of The State Of New York, 788 A.2d 146 (D.C Court of Appeals, 2001), 392
- Triple A Management Co v Frisone, 69 Cal.App.4th 520 (1999), 679
- Tucker v. Lassen Sav. & Loan Assn. 12 Cal. 3d 629 (1974), 647
- Tucker v. Lassen Savings and Loan Ass'n., 12 Cal. 3d 629 (1974), 420
- Tully v. World Savings & Loan Ass'n., 56 Cal. App. 4th 654 (1997), 525
- Tully v. World Savings, 56 Cal. App. 4th 654 (1997), 525, 552
- \*Turner v. Lytton Sav. & Loan Assn., 242 Cal. App. 2d 457 (1966), 381
- U.S. Financial v. Sullivan, 37 Cal. App. 3d 5 (1974), 238
- Union Bank v. Anderson, 232 Cal. App. 3d 941 (1991), 20
- \*Union Bank v. Gradsky, 265 Cal. App. 2d 40 (1968), 251
- \*Union Bank v. Wendland, 54 Cal. App. 3d 393 (1976), 336, 624
- Union Bank v. Wolas (In re ZZZZ Best Co., Inc.), 501 U.S. 151 (1991), 568
- United Bank v. K&W Trucking Co., 147 Cal. App. 3d 217 (1983), 101
- United California Bank v. Tijerina, 25 Cal. App. 3d 963 (1972), 46
- United Savings & Loan v. Hoffman, 30 Cal. App. 3d 306 (1973), 206
- United Savings Assn. v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Associates, 484 U.S. 365 (1988), 141
- United States Cold Storage v. Great Western Sav. & Loan, 165 Cal. App. 3d 1214 (1985), 560
- United States of America v. Johnson, 956 F.2d 197 (9th Cir. 1992), 233
- United States of America v. Laykin, 886 F.2d 1534 (9th Cir. 1989), 195
- United States v. 403 1/2 Skyline Drive, 797 F. Supp. 796 (1992), 241
- United States v. Brosnan, 363 U.S. 237 (1960), 539
- United States v. Ellis, 714 F.2d 953 (9th Cir. 1983), 588
- United States v. Haddon Hacienda Company, 541 F.2d 777 (1976), 234
- United States v. MacKenzie, 510 F.2d 39 (9th Cir. 1975), 587–588
- United States v. Sage, 566 F.2d 1114 (9th Cir. 1977), 431
- United States v. Shimer, 367 U.S. 374 (1961), 98
- \*United States v. Stadium Apartments, Inc., 425 F.2d 358 (9th Cir. 1970), 578

- United States v. Thornburg, 82 F.3d 886 (9th Cir. 1996), 474
- United States v. View Crest Garden Apts., 268 F.2d 380, (9th Cir. 1959), 578–579, 586
- UREZ Corp. v. Superior Court, 190 Cal. App. 3d 1141 (1987), 571
- USX Corp. v. H. H. Champlin, 992 F.3d 1380 (5th Cir. 1993), 481
- \*Valley Investments, L.P. v. Bancamerica Commercial Corporation, 88 Cal. App. 4th 816 (2001), 184
- \*Valley Title Co. v. Parish Egg Basket, Inc., 31 Cal. App. 3d 776 (1973), 352
- Van Loben Sels v. Bunnell, 120 Cal. 680 (1898), 327
- Van Loben Sels v. Bunnell, 131 Cal. 489 (1901), 487
- Vandewater v. McRae, 27 Cal. 596, 38
- \*Van Vleck Realty v. Gaunt, 250 Cal. App. 2d 81 (1967), 105
- Vella v. Hudgins, 67 Cal. App. 3d 820 (1977), 558
- \*Venable v. Harmon, 233 Cal. App. 2d 297 (1965), 699
- Ventura-Louise, In re, 490 F.2d 1141 (9th Cir. 1974), 199
- Vilkin v. Sommer, 260 Cal. App. 2d 687 (1968), 280
- Vlahovich v. Cruz, 213 Cal. App. 3d 317 (1989), 466
- W. P. Fuller & Co. v. McClure, 48 Cal. App. 185 (1920), 170
- Walker v. California Mortgage Service (In re Walker), 861 F.2d 597 (9th Cir. 1988), 551
- Walker v. California Mortgage Service (In re Walker), 861 F.2d 597 (9th Cir. 1988), 551
- \*Walker v. Community Bank, 10 Cal. 3d 729 (1974), 42
- Walker v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc., 98 Cal. App. 4th 1158 (2002), 529
- \*Walley v. P.M.C. Inv. Co., 262 Cal. App. 2d 218 (1968), 327
- Walter E. Heller Western Inc. v. Bloxham, 176 Cal.App.3d 266, 92, 94–95
- Walters v. Marler, 83 Cal. App. 3d 1 (1978), 734
- Ward v. Union Bond & Trust Co., 243 F.2d 476 (9th Cir. 1957), 704
- Warner Bros. v. Freud, 138 Cal. 651 (1903), 669
- Watska First National Bank v. Ruda, 135 Ill.2d 140 (1990), 426
- Webber v. Inland Empire Investments, Inc., 74 Cal. App. 4th 884 (1999), 573
- \*Wehle v. Price, 202 Cal. 394 (1927), 149
- Weisman, In re, 5 F.3d 417 (9th Cir. 1993), 132
- \*Wellenkamp v. Bank of America, 21 Cal. 3d 943 (1978), 420, 646
- Wells Fargo Bank v. Arizona Laborers, Teamsters and Cement Masons Local No. 35 Pension Trust Fund, 38 P.3d 12 (2002), 604
- \*Wells Fargo Bank, N. A. v. Bank of America NT&SA, 32 Cal. App.4th 424 (1995), 177
- Western Fuel Co. v. S. G. Lewald Co., 90 Cal. 25 (1922), 30
- Western Security Bank v. Superior Court, 15 Cal. 4th 232 (1997), 261
- Western Security Bank, N.A. v. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County, 21 Cal. App. 4th 156 (1993), 261
- Westinghouse Credit Corporation v. Barton, 789 F. Supp. 1043 (1992), 265
- Whitehead v. Derwinski, 904 F.2d 1362 (9th Cir. 1990), 98
- White Point Co. v. Herrington, 268 Cal. App. 2d 458, 276
- Whitman v. Tran-state Title Co. (1985) 165 CA3d 312, 559
- Wilhelm v. Fimple, 31 Iowa 131, 727
- Williams v. Fassler (1980) 110 Cal.App.3d 7, 394
- Williams v. United Investment Corp. (In re Williams), 124 B.R. 311, 551
- \*Wilson v. Steele, 211 Cal.App.3d 1053 (1989), 669
- \*Windt v. Covert, 152 Cal. 350 (1907), 429
- Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal.App.3d 909, 917, 122
- Wolfert v. Guadagno, 130 Cal. App. 661 (1933), 633
- \*Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Ass'n, 56 Cal. App. 3d 286 (1976), 620
- Wright v. Johnston, 206 Cal. App. 3d 333 (1988), 86
- Wright v. Ross, 36 Cal. 414 (1868), 669
- \*Wyzard v. Goller, 23 Cal.App. 4th 1183 (1994), 656
- \*Yackey v. Pacifica Development Co., 99 Cal. App. 3d 776 (1979), 275
- Yates, Estate of (1994) 25 CA4th 511, 559
- Yunker v. Reseda Manor, 255 Cal. App. 2d 431 (1967), 63
- Ziello v. Superior Court, 36 Cal. App. 4th 321 (1995), 217
- Ziegler v. Barnes, 200 Cal. App. 3d 224 (1988), 88
- Zimmer, In re 313 F.3d 1220, (9th Cir. 2002), 141





---


# Preface

---


“Necessitous men are not, truly speaking, free men, but, to answer a present exigency, will submit to any terms that the crafty may impose upon them.” —Lord Chancellor Northington, 1762.

“By the growth of equity on equity, the heart of the common law is eaten out, and legal settlements are destroyed.” —Chief Justice Hale, 1672.

## Why This Course?



At this moment, you may well be wondering whether you really ought to be taking this class or switching over into some field more exciting, or at least less formidable. Like as not, your intentions are to practice in the more glamorous areas of the law, and to turn over all complicated real estate matters to that rather square mortgage specialist down the hall. In lieu of any academic apology for this course, you are invited to read the sad story of Carl Mooslin, a Los Angeles attorney, who received twenty-eight dollars for the services he rendered to his long-time client, and wound up being liable to her for \$42,000.



---

### **Starr v. Mooslin**

14 Cal. App. 3d 988 (1971)

HERNDON-Defendant and appellant Carl J. Mooslin, an attorney at law, appeals from the judgment awarding plaintiff damages in this action for legal malpractice. Plaintiff Elena Starr charged that as the result of defendant’s negligence in representing her in a transaction involving a sale of real property, she suffered damages in the sum of \$50,000. The judgment against defendant in the amount of \$42,000 was entered upon the verdict of a jury.

Plaintiff, a woman in her eighties, was the owner of real property located at 355 South Alvarado Street, Los Angeles. Defendant, a practicing attorney and engaged in the general practice of law, had handled various legal matters for plaintiff over a period of approximately ten years. Some time in the year 1965 plaintiff decided that she would offer her property for sale. Thereafter she received offers from Lucius Foster and William Cooper. Plaintiff discussed some of these offers with the defendant. On Janu-

ary 4, 1966, plaintiff and defendant met with Foster and Cooper at defendant's law office. At this meeting the parties negotiated further with respect to the purchase and sale of the property but no agreement was reached. Foster stated that he would not be participating in the transaction as a principal but that a Mr. Robert Fisher, 'an experienced builder and developer' whom he represented, would offer \$60,000 for the property, \$10,000 to be paid in cash at the close of escrow with the balance to be evidenced by a \$50,000 promissory note secured by a deed of trust. The offer further provided that the purchase money deed of trust would be subordinated at a later date to a \$275,000 construction loan. The money for construction purposes would be borrowed in installments, the first to be in the amount of \$30,000. Foster further stated that Fisher would be willing to provide additional security by way of a deed of trust on other real property he owned.

On the following day, January 5, 1966, Mrs. Starr decided that she would accept the offer as presented by Foster on behalf of Fisher. After calling Foster and informing him of her decision, she called defendant and requested that he appear at the City National Bank in Beverly Hills at the time appointed to represent her in the opening of the escrow for the purpose of effectuating the sale. In response to plaintiff's request, defendant went to the City National Bank and, after verifying the terms of the sale with the parties present, proceeded to dictate escrow instructions to an employee of the bank using a printed form.

The escrow instructions thus prepared provided for a total purchase price of \$63,000 of which \$10,000 was to be paid in cash and the balance to be evidenced by a \$50,000 promissory note payable to plaintiff secured by a purchase money deed of trust. Further provision was made for the delivery to Foster of a note in the amount of \$3,000 to cover his broker's commission. Fisher and Cooper and/or their nominee were named as purchasers. By a subsequent amendment to these instructions the purchase price was reduced to \$60,000 and the provision for the promissory note in payment of Foster's commission was eliminated. The instructions further provided that the buyer would execute and place in escrow a deed of trust as additional security in favor of the seller on real property located at Roseland and LaBrea. Beneath the foregoing provisions the following language as dictated by defendant was typewritten into the instructions: "The following is stated as a matter of record only with which the escrow holder is not to be concerned: (1) Seller agrees to subordinate on demand, to a 1st trust deed, not to exceed \$275,000.00, bearing interest at not more than 7.5% per annum, for not more than 30 years. Seller agrees to subordinate forthwith to \$30,000.00, the same being a portion of the above referred to \$275,000.00 loan, and will execute upon demand any additional subordination agreement in order to enable Buyer to refinance or to increase the encumbrance to be placed upon the land provided the same shall not exceed in total \$275,000.00 represented by a single 1st trust deed."

Within a few days thereafter Fisher made arrangements to borrow \$30,000 from Irving and Matilda Scham and Ben and Eva Solomon. This loan was to be evidenced by a promissory note secured by a first deed of trust on the property which plaintiff had agreed to sell to Fisher. On January 18, 1966, Fisher and the parties from whom he was borrowing the \$30,000 opened an escrow at LaCienega Escrow Company for the purpose of effectuating that loan. Fisher deposited therein his promissory note and the lenders deposited the \$30,000.

On the following day, January 19, 1966, Fisher deposited in the original escrow at City National Bank his promissory note in the amount of \$50,000 payable to plaintiff and the two deeds of trust on the subject property, one of which was security for the

\$30,000 loan and the other was to secure plaintiff's \$50,000 note. Plaintiff's deed of trust contained on its face the following provision: 'This deed of trust is second and subject to a first deed of trust to record concurrently.'

On January 24, 1966, the LaCienega Escrow Company paid out \$10,150 to the City National Bank for plaintiff's account, \$18,265 to Robert Fisher, \$300 to Lucius Foster, and \$1,285 to other persons not involved in this case.

According to the testimony of the employee of City National Bank who handled the escrow for that institution, the instruments deposited therein were recorded pursuant to the oral direction of defendant and the escrow was thereupon closed. As a result of these procedures plaintiff's \$50,000 purchase money deed of trust and the \$30,000 deed of trust held by the Schams and Solomons were recorded concurrently. Plaintiff's deed of trust was thereby subordinated.

Subsequently, Fisher failed to make the payments on the Scham-Solomon note. Fisher's default resulted in foreclosure proceedings instituted by the Schams and the Solomons. At the trustee's sale the property was purchased by the beneficiaries. Plaintiff was unable to bid at the sale because of her lack of sufficient funds. The purchasers at the foreclosure sale thereafter brought an unlawful detainer action against Mrs. Starr to obtain possession. Mrs. Starr filed an answer and cross-complaint naming as cross-defendants Fisher, Cooper, Foster, the Schams, the Solomons, and others, and charging said cross-defendants with fraud and conspiracy to deprive her of her property. This litigation was terminated by a settlement whereby Mrs. Starr repurchased her property for \$32,500.

Immediately thereafter plaintiff resold the property for \$57,500 of which \$32,500 was paid to the buyers at the foreclosure sale. Plaintiff received \$1,500 in cash and a promissory note in the amount of \$14,035 secured by a deed of trust on the subject property. Approximately \$800 was expended in escrow expenses and \$8,167 was paid over to Mr. J.J. Brandlin as compensation for his legal services.

Thereafter the instant action against defendant was filed by Mrs. Starr. Her complaint alleges that defendant, as an attorney, undertook to represent her and to act as her attorney in consummating the sale of her property. It is further alleged in substance that defendant negligently performed his duties in that he failed to use that degree of learning, skill and judgment ordinarily used by lawyers of good standing and practicing in the same locality under similar circumstances and as a proximate result of such negligence plaintiff was damaged in the sum of \$50,000.

Except for the opinions of the expert witnesses hereinafter summarized, the evidence was virtually uncontradicted. On cross-examination by counsel for plaintiff, defendant testified that he was acquainted with subordination agreements and recognized that such agreements ordinarily provided that the proceeds from secured loans would be used to improve the real property. Defendant did not research the applicable law prior to preparing the escrow instructions in this case. At the time of this transaction it was defendant's understanding that it was probably the law that if plaintiff and the buyer entered into a subordination agreement which provided that the buyer was to use the \$30,000 to improve the property and if the lenders of the \$30,000 had notice thereof and plaintiff did not waive her rights under the subordination agreement and if the \$30,000 was not so used, the subordination would not be effective and plaintiff's trust deed would retain its priority. Notwithstanding his uncertainty on the subject, however, defendant did not research the law and the escrow instructions as prepared by him did not contain such provisions.

Plaintiff called Dennis G. Harkavy, an attorney at law, as an expert witness. The qualifications of this witness as indicated by his testimony are unquestioned. Over defendant's objection made solely on the ground that expert testimony is inadmissible to prove negligence in a legal malpractice suit, the witness was permitted to state his opinion in response to a hypothetical question whether or not, on the basis of the facts assumed, defendant had exercised that degree of learning, care and skill ordinarily possessed by attorneys in good standing practicing in the Los Angeles area at about this time and under similar circumstances. The witness answered: 'In my opinion the requisite skill of a general practitioner was not employed in drawing these instructions.' The witness thereafter stated at length the reasons for his opinion and pointed out in detail the several respects in which he considered the escrow instructions deficient.

Defense counsel called two expert witnesses, attorney David Sefman and the Honorable Alfred Gitelson, a judge of the Superior Court. The rulings of the trial court permitted each of these witnesses to testify to his extensive experience in relation to the handling of escrows in similar transactions. Each of these witnesses was permitted over plaintiff's objections to testify to his opinion that in conformity with prevailing custom and practice among escrow agencies, a reasonably careful escrow holder would not have recorded the deeds of trust as was done in the instant case but would have required something more in the way of authorization than was required by the City National Bank in this case. Each of defendant's expert witnesses was permitted to testify to his opinion that an attorney engaged in the general practice of law in the community exercising reasonable care could properly rely upon the custom and usage prevailing among escrow holders concerning which the witnesses previously had testified. The witness thereafter testified at some length in giving his reasons for that opinion. The essence of his testimony was that in recording the deeds of trust, the City National Bank had transgressed against the established custom and practice of escrow holders upon which defendant had reasonably relied. On the basis of the testimony of the two experts called by him, defense counsel argued in the trial court that the conceded deficiencies in the escrow instructions were not the proximate cause of plaintiff's damages.

The inadequacy of the escrow instructions to afford plaintiff the protection which the circumstances involved in this case obviously required is undeniable and virtually conceded. No lawyer with knowledge of the most elementary rules of law governing such transactions would have failed to insist upon more adequate provisions to insure that all of the proceeds of the \$30,000 loan, which was to be given security prior to that of his client's purchase money lien, would be used to improve the property.

The teachings of hindsight were not necessary to prove that it was negligent and hazardous to fail to provide such protection. This truth is emphasized by the fact that there was no requirement that the construction loan would be obtained from an institutional lender which could be relied upon to see that the proceeds of the loan were properly used to improve the real property. Moreover, it is an apparent fact that defendant made no inquiry or investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the reliability, financial or otherwise, of the purchaser or the value of the other property which he had promised to encumber as additional security.

In these circumstances it is understandable that defendant and his trial counsel based their defense entirely upon the contention that it was not the conceded deficiencies in the escrow instructions prepared by defendant, but rather it was the mistake or misconduct of the City National Bank as escrow agent, which constituted the proximate cause of plaintiff's loss. The only possible basis upon which defendant could claim freedom from negligence was his contention that he had justifiably relied upon an asserted cus-

tom and practice among escrow agents which the City National Bank violated when it delivered the two deeds of trust for recordation. This contention necessarily implies that defendant contemplated the taking of further unspecified steps to protect his client's interests prior to the closing of the escrow.

Since the trial court submitted the issue of defendant's negligence to the jury upon legally correct instructions, we need not decide the arguable contention that defendant was guilty of negligence as a matter of law.

The trial court's instructions clearly advised the jury that plaintiff could not recover unless she had proved by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant's negligence was a proximate cause of her injury. Defendant's argument fails to recognize that an attorney's negligence need not be the sole cause of the client's loss in order to subject him to liability. That is to say, where there is causation in fact it need not be the sole proximate cause.

The judgment and the order denying defendant's motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict are affirmed.

FLEMING-I concur in the opinion but find an additional basis for defendant's liability viz. his negligence in allowing his client to be defrauded and swindled out of her property.

Under the purported sale of plaintiff's real property for \$60,000, the purchaser put up nothing and used the seller's own property as security to borrow \$30,000, out of which he paid \$10,000 to the seller and pocketed the balance of \$20,000 for his own use. When the document is stripped of its documentary window dressing, it becomes readily apparent that plaintiff was relieved of assets of a value of \$20,000. Such a transaction amounts to elementary fraud, for protection against which persons employ lawyers to provide advice and counsel. If a lawyer fails to provide advice and counsel of sufficient quality to enable his client to protect herself against such an obvious swindle, he may be held liable for the ensuing loss.

The foregoing covers the bare-faced swindle. The more genteel, dressed up version concocted by the buyer and his agents was only slightly less rapacious. Under this version the buyer agreed to put up the \$10,000, and the seller agreed to subordinate the unpaid balance of the purchase price, \$50,000, to a \$275,000 construction loan. Even if it should turn out that the lien ahead of plaintiff represented moneys actually expended in improving the property, plaintiff's security would remain wholly vulnerable to a complete wipe-out if any mild deflation in real estate values occurred, for her security interests would have been subordinated to 82 per cent of the total amount put into the venture, and the entire loan of \$275,000 would have to be repaid before she could realize anything on her security. Under such a deal plaintiff would be saddled with the primary risk of speculative loss and wholly excluded from any hope of speculative gain. These terms are so one-sided and so unfair as to be only slightly less fraudulent than the bald fraud which actually took place.

Here again, a lawyer who has been employed to represent the interests of a seller is required to provide advice and counsel which will enable his client to protect herself against such imposition, and if he does not adequately do this he may become liable for losses suffered by his client as a result of his negligence. Needless to say, these considerations have special application to the case at bench, where the client was an eighty-year-old, semi-literate widow of limited means and limited business experience. In representing such clients, lawyers are required to exercise extra caution, for these clients are not equipped to protect themselves.

## Notes

1. *The risky real estate law business.* A study by the National Legal Malpractice Data Center of 18,000 cases from 1981 to 1983 showed that “Lawyers face the greatest risk of becoming the target of a malpractice lawsuit in representing clients in real estate matters...”.

The percentage was 24.9%, compared to the next most risky danger area (plaintiff’s personal injury) of 24%. Furthermore, whereas the major error (48.9%) in personal injury litigation was “administrative” (e.g., missing deadlines), “substantive” errors in real estate accounted for 56.7% of those claims. See Gates, *The Newest Date on Lawyer’s Malpractice Claims*, 70 ABA Journal 78 (April, 1984).

2. *Could you do better?* How obvious is it that Mooslin’s escrow instructions were “unquestionably deficient” and constituted malpractice, even for a general practitioner? If Mooslin had realized that he was into a tricky subordination problem he obviously should have called in an expert real estate attorney to help him out, but his problem appears to be that he did not know that this was a dangerous area. In that regard there are probably many attorneys just like him. Most lawyers consider helping a client sell her property as an easy affair. But \$42,000 is a lot of money to pay for taking the matter too casually.

3. *The thinking of a borrower.* Suppose Foster & Cooper were only out to make an honest dollar on this project. The land cost them \$60,000 and construction will probably cost \$300,000 (the \$275,000 rounded up to make these calculations easier), so the final product must be worth at least \$360,000 to make sense. In fact it had better be worth more, since it will take time to build. Assuming construction takes a year and interest on the loans is 9%, the project has to be worth another \$32,000 to cover that (\$27,000 interest on the construction loan and \$5,000 interest, more or less, to Elena Starr on the \$50,000 owed to her on the price). All told, the completed project has to be worth at least \$392,000 at the end to cover all this. Assume they estimated a finished value of \$400,000, so that they would be able to sell it off at the end for an \$8,000 profit.

Suppose Foster & Cooper had \$360,000 themselves; wouldn’t it make more sense to use their own money, save the interest costs, and thereby make a \$40,000 profit (\$400,000 sale price less \$360,000 costs)? Not at all. By using their own funds, they would make a profit of 11% (\$40,000 profit ÷ \$360,000 investment). But borrowing most of the funds (\$300,000 from the construction lender and \$50,000 from Elena Starr), even though they had to pay interest, gave them a return on investment of 80% (\$8,000 profit on a \$10,000 personal outlay), more than seven times better! Even if Foster & Cooper had the \$360,000 available, they were better off dividing it into 36 similar deals, each costing them \$10,000, rather than putting all the money into this one deal.

This is leverage and Foster & Cooper would probably write a book about how they made millions of dollars in real estate if it always worked out so well. (But calculate what happens if the project sold for 3% less than anticipated.) Although not always successful, the principle of leverage does explain why people borrow money in real estate deals, even if they have the funds themselves. It is how rational borrowers/speculators think.

Most of this book is devoted to how lenders think when lending money, but it may be important to remember that, at the start, it is usually the borrower who decides to get the loan (and to put up with what the lender demands for making the loan).

4. *The wrong villain?* Also note that Elena Starr, the “eighty-year-old, semi-literate widow of limited means and limited business experiences” was the creditor; it was the

debtors, Fisher and Cooper, who were the scoundrels, which is somewhat inconsistent with the classic notion of the scheming, sneering lender of riverboat melodramas. Watch out, in the cases that follow, for who the “bad guys” are.

