	Helen A. Duree SB 110546
	Attorney at Law 238 Stony Creek Drive
	Orland, CA 95963
	Tel: (530) 865-2757 Fax: (530) 865-2427
	Attorney for Defendant Sarina Ann Nelson
	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF GLENN
	COUNTI OF CEENIN
	DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST ) Case No.: 10NUD00320
	COMPANY, AS TRUSTEE OF THE OF T
	TRIAL BRIEF
	Plaintiff ) Dept: TBD
	vs. ) Trial Date: 01/24/2011
(	SARINA ANN NELSON, and Does 1-50 ) Judge: Jeri Hamlin
İ	inclusive
	Defendants
	INTRODUCTION
Г	DEFENDANT Sarina Ann Nelson, resides at 4081 County Rd., #203,
	amilton City, CA 95951. Various members of the Nelson family
	have owned the property for more than 100 years. On October 8,
	2010, PLAINTIFF, Deutsche Bank National Trust, hereinafter
	referred to as DB, filed an Unlawful Detainer action against
	DEFENDANT, Sarina Ann Nelson. DEFENDANT asserts as her first
	Affirmative Defense, that DB lacks standing for this action, as
	follows:
	I.
	DB IS NOT A REAL PARTY IN INTEREST IN THIS ACTION AND
	THEREFORE LACKS STANDING
	1. PLAINTIFF has failed to provide to the court proof of
	perfected title on the property in question, located at 4081
	County Rd. #203. Hamilton City. CA 95951.

2.0

2. PLAINTIFF falsely states to the court in paragraph #4 of its complaint that it is the owner of the property described above.

3. PLAINTIFF falsely states to the court in paragraph #5 of its complaint that "On March 26, 2010, PLAINTIFF acquired the property at a duly conducted foreclosure sale and obtained a Trustee's Deed upon Sale."

4. In fact, an <u>Assignment of Deed of Trust</u> (Attached as Exhibit "A") purporting to transfer all rights under the original Deed of Trust dated 03/01/2007, from OneWest Bank, FSB to DB was signed by an officer of OneWest Bank, FSB and notarized on 02/25/2010. One full month before the date PLAINTIFF claims to have acquired the property "at a duly conducted foreclosure sale" (Emphasis added) which allegedly took place on 3/26/2010.

5. There exists a serious cloud over the title of the property in question. North State Title, Glenn County, CA recorded document No. 2009-5065 on 10/23/2009. (Attached as Exhibit "B") The document is titled Assignment of Deed of Trust, and purports to:

1) have been executed on 6/23/2009, and 2) to transfer all interest in the original Deed of Trust, dated 03/01/2007, from MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC., hereinafter referred to as MERS, to OneWest Band, FSB.

6. DEFENDANT asserts and intends to prove: 1) that MERS was not a trustee under the Deed of Trust and did not have the legal authority to assign the deed of trust; and, 2) that the purported Assignment of Deed of Trust was signed by Dennis Kirkpatrick as Vice President for MERS and well documented as a "Robo-Signer." Therefore the transaction described above, purportedly executed on 6/23/2009 and recorded as described above on 10/23/2009, was and is null and void.

7. DEFENDANT asserts and intends to prove that, as a result of the nullity of the transaction described in paragraph 6 above, chain of title to the property was broken and therefore any subsequent purported assignments were also null and void. Therefore, DB does not hold valid title to the property which is the subject of this litigation.

-

THE VERIFICATION OF THE COMPLAINT IS INVALID

8.DEFENDANT asserts that the Verification of the Complaint is not only invalid but is blatantly false.

- 9. PLAINTIFF'S attorney, Edward T. Weber, ESQ, who states in the verification that his office is in Orange County, CA, signed and dated the verification, wherein it states "that all officers of the Plaintiff are unable to make the verification because they are absent from said County..." (Emphasis added).
- Deutsche Bank National Trust Company (Attached as Exhibit "C") lists 5 offices in Orange County, California. An officer of DB is the appropriate signer on a Verification of Complaint, as that person would have access to the internal records of DB and be able to verify the truth of the facts stated in the Complaint.

III.

## PLAINTIFF HAS FAILED TO PROVIDE A COPY OF THE ORIGINAL PROMISSORY NOTE

- 1. DEFENDANT requested a copy of the original Promissory Note, which was alleged to have been signed on 3/1/2007, from her original lender.
- 2. DEFENDANT was told by a representative of the company that he was unable to give her a copy of the Note, as it had been sold, but he could not tell DEFENDANT to whom it was sold.
- 3. DEFENDANT believes and intends to prove that the original Promissory Note was "securitized" and converted to a stock. As a result, there was no longer a negotiable instrument which could be secured by the Deed of Trust.
- 4. The Deed of Trust cannot stand alone. If DB does not own the Promissory Note, then the Deed of Trust it allegedly held fails and is unenforceable at law.

## CONCLUSION

1	The chain of title on the property which is the subject of this
2	litigation has been broken. DB does not, and did not have the
3	right to foreclose on the property; and, does not, and did not
4	have the right to sell or purchase the property; and, does not
4	and did not have standing to file an Unlawful Detainer complaint
5	against DEFENDANT.
6	PLAINTIFF'S complaint fails due to an invalid Verification.
7	DEFENDANT hereby requests a 90 day continuation of this Unlawful
8	Detainer action to allow DEFENDANT time to conduct Discovery in
	order to gather the necessary information and documentation to
9	prove DEFENDANT'S assertions that have been made herein.
10	DEFENDANT pleads with the court that it would be a serious
11	miscarriage of justice to allow PLAINTIFF to evict her from her
12	property, which her family has owned for over 100 years, without
13	being made to prove that PLAINTIFF is the true and legal owner of
	the title to the property.
14	Date: 1/14/2011
15	
16	Helen A. Duree Attorney for Defendant Sarina Nelson
17	necotney for befoldanc Salina Nelson
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	.1

26

27

28