



October 5, 2013

The Honorable Craig L. Griffin, Presiding Judge
Deborah C. Servino, Judge
Peter J. Wilson, Judge
Appellate Division, Orange County Superior Court
West Justice Center, 751 West Santa Ana Blvd
Santa Ana, California 92701

RE: Request for Publication of *Huntington Continental Town House Association v The JM Trust dated Jan 1 2005, Joseph A. Miner Trustee and Joseph A. Miner, individually* Case Number 2013 – 00623099 Filed Sept 26, 2013

Dear Judges Griffin, Servino, and Wilson:

Pursuant to California Rules of Court Rule 8.1105, the Center for California Homeowner Association Law (“CCHAL”), is submitting an *amicus curiae* letter to the Orange County Appellate Division to ask that *Huntington Continental Town House Association v JM Trust* (“*Huntington*”) be certified for publication.

The Court’s opinion in *Huntington* merits publication because it satisfies the standards for publication set forth in the Rules of the Court 8.1105, specifically it

- Modifies, explains, or criticizes, with reasons given, an existing rule of law
- Advances a new interpretation, clarification, criticism, or construction of a provision of a constitution, statute, ordinance, or court rule;
- Involves a legal issue of continuing public interest
- Provides guidance to the lower courts hearing homeowner association assessment collection/foreclosure cases

NATURE OF THE AMICUS CURIAE’S INTEREST IN HUNTINGTON

The Center for California Homeowner Association Law (www.calhomelaw.org) is a statewide 501(c)(3), tax-exempt non-profit entity whose mission is to protect the legal rights of the estimated 9 million persons, who live in California’s 50,000 common interest developments [aka CIDs and/or “homeowner associations.”] ¹

Assessment collection and foreclosure by associations – the subject of *Huntington* – is the primary policy focus of the Center. To advance our mission, we initiate and monitor state legislation impacting the legal rights of association homeowners. We also sponsor

¹ In 2011, associations comprised an estimated 4.9 million units or 25% of California’s housing stock. See Assembly Housing Committee analysis of AB805, pp 3-4, April 6, 2011.

legislation that will create new consumer protections for homeowners. We were, for example, sponsors of SB137/Ducheny (2006 Statutes) establishing the debt thresholds that must be reached before an association can use nonjudicial foreclosure to force payment of assessments. These thresholds are referenced in *Huntington*.

HUNTINGTON EXPLAINS, WITH REASONS GIVEN, AN EXISTING RULE OF LAW

The statute at issue in *Huntington* is Civil Code §1367.4(b) created through consumer protection legislation authored by Congresswoman Jackie Speier, when she was in the California Legislature (AB1317, 1997 Statutes.)²

Huntington makes clear that

“Civil Code §1367.4(b) allows for partial payments and delineates to what debts, and which order, payments are to be applied. The plain language of subdivision (b) contemplates partial payments, and not just payments in full satisfaction of the amounts owed. There would be no need to explain how payments are to be applied to the various charges if the Legislature contemplated only payments in full,” says the Huntington ruling.

The opinion is critical, because associations routinely reject partial payments of assessment debt. What are the legal strategies for accomplishing this? Unbeknownst to property owners, association boards strike private contracts with assessment debt collectors that intentionally subvert Civil Code 1367.4(b). The contracts void the duties of associations under this statute and simultaneously void the rights of homeowners (1) to make partial payments and (2) to have those payments applied according to the prescriptions of Civil Code 1367.4(b), i.e. to assessments first until they are paid down in full and only after they are paid in full to the discharging of collection costs.

The Center, in the course of its legislative work, has collected dozens of sample contracts between associations and the debt collection firms specializing in assessment collection.³ The contracts state clearly that the two parties to the contract – association and debt collector – are devising private agreements for the application of homeowner payments: arrangements that negate the statute and circumvent its consumer protections.

The most prominent feature of these contracts is that the debt collector alone will decide how payments are to be applied to the homeowner account. The contracts state that the debt collector will pay himself first instead of last, as required by Civil Code §1367.4(b)⁴

² Her bill was triggered by a Sea Ranch foreclosure in which the home was auctioned for \$2400 in order to recover \$567 in homeowner assessments. The auction winners then offered to sell it back to the homeowner for \$180,000. The homeowner later sued Sea Ranch and recovered his home (*Mahaffey v Sea Ranch*, Sonoma County Sup Court.) His attorney Michael G. Miller testified in support of her bill: see http://leginfo.ca.gov/pub/95-96/bill/asm/ab_1301-1350/ab_1317_cfa_960828_224816_sen_floor.html. See also Santa Rosa Press Democrat, “Taken by Surprise: Sea Ranch Home Sold for \$2400,” December 17, 1994.

³ See for example, Association Lien Services (ALS) and Heather Farms Association; and the Angius & Terry Collections Agreement and the Feldsott & Lee contract for Assessment Collection Service.

⁴ A sample contract devised by Sunrise Assessment Collection Services, an association debt collector, and sent to a Sacramento County homeowner is posted on the Center’s website at <http://www.calhomelaw.org/PDF/Anon%20D%202010%20april%2017.pdf>

Orange County Appellate Court
The Honorable Craig L. Griffin, Presiding
Huntington Town Homes v Miner
October 10, 2013

The collections contract between Feldsott & Lee and Huntington Town Homes exemplifies this practice. Says page 1 of its contract: *"Monies collected from (homeowner) member shall be first applied to payment of attorneys fees to ATTORNEY, then costs and the remainder to assessments."*

This provision of the contract generated by the law firm of Feldsott & Lee and executed by Huntington Town Homes is in clear contravention of California Civil Code 1367.4(b).

After such a contract is executed with the association, debt collectors routinely send a contract to the homeowner reflecting the terms of its contract with the association, namely: that the debt collector alone will determine the application of payments. Most contracts include the exact language of Civil Code 1367.4(b) but demand that the homeowner waive his consumer protection rights under it. If the homeowner refuses to sign the contract waiving his rights, the debt collector won't give him a payment plan, i.e. allow him to make partial payments. If the homeowner attempts to make partial payments to the association, the board rejects them under color of the agreement that it has executed with the debt collector.

Because the association and the debt collector both reject partial payments, the home often goes into foreclosure.⁵

Huntington rightly clarifies another issue: that improper application of payments means that the homeowner association *"did not adjust its interest accrued calculations for the unapplied payment, causing the damages awarded to be excessive and not supported by the evidence."*

Again: this is a critical point, because the assessment debt is the foundation for calculating most of the collection costs, e.g. late charges and interest, for example. Keeping the assessment debt balance high is the key strategy for calculating additional collection charges and for extending the debt into the 12-month territory, allowing the debt collector to foreclose. *Huntington* clarifies that the improper application of payments is prohibited under existing law for yet another reason: because it expands the debt instead of diminishing it.

ASSESSMENT COLLECTION AND PARTIAL PAYMENTS ARE LEGAL ISSUES OF CONTINUING PUBLIC INTEREST

Assessment collection and foreclosure have been issues of continuing public interest in the State Legislature. Since the Speier bill (AB1317, 1997 Statutes), legislation has been routinely introduced in the Legislature to rein in specific business practices by associations and firms specializing in assessment collection and foreclosure.⁶

⁵ The number of trustee foreclosure sales resulting from these practices was documented by Sentinel Fair Housing (Alameda County) via research it did on association foreclosures in five Bay Area counties over a 12-month period. Sentinel presented its research at public hearings in Sacramento convened by State Senator Denise Ducheny.

⁶ AB2289/Kehoe (Due Process in Nonjudicial Foreclosure – signed into law); AB1836/Harman (Internal Dispute Resolution Procedures – signed into law); SB 1682/Ducheny and AB2598/Steinberg (both set thresholds to be reached before an association could use foreclosure as a collections tool; vetoed by Governor); SB137/Ducheny (established thresholds to be met; signed into law); AB1098/Jones (Homeowner right to access financial records – signed into law); AB2624/Houston (trustee supervision of post-foreclosure redemption);

Individual lawmakers, like Assembly Member Julia Brownley,⁷ State Senators Denise Ducheny, Ellen Corbett, and Darrell Steinberg and other lawmakers have taken up the issue. When she was chair of the Senate Housing Committee, State Senator Denise Ducheny convened public hearings on assessment collection after a Calaveras County association foreclosed on the \$275,000 home of a disabled owner, who owed a \$120. (sic) annual assessment.⁸ The home was auctioned for \$70,000. After the hearings Ducheny introduced SB1682 to establish thresholds that must be met before an association could use foreclosure as a collections tool. This bill was vetoed by the Governor but her second bill, SB137, with similar threshold provisions, was signed into law.⁹

The Center for California Homeowner Association Law (CCHAL) sponsored several of the bills listed in the footnotes. With the California Alliance for Retired Americans (CARA), we also sponsored two bills (AB2502/Brownley) and SB561/Corbett¹⁰ that dealt specifically with the partial payment issue addressed in *Huntington*.¹¹ Both bills dealt with the contract issue, i.e. that contracts between associations and debt collectors whose purpose was to negate Civil Code §1367.4(b) were null and void. They also clarified that homeowners have the statutory right, under the Speier statute, to make partial payments.

However, both bills were defeated by the association industry and its debt collectors. The key argument used by debt collectors is that Civil Code 1367.1 and 1367.4 does not apply to them; they assert that it applies only to associations, when associations are collecting assessments. Despite clear evidence to the contrary, debt collectors also deny “coercing” homeowners into signing payment plans requiring them to waive their consumer protection rights under Civil Code 1367.4(b). These arguments are exemplified by a six-page letter of opposition from Association Lien Services (ALS) to Senator Corbett’s legislation SB561.¹² ALS, a subdivision of the law firm of Swedelson & Gottlieb, has a huge share of the assessment collection market in California.¹³

Huntington is a critical decision because, through it, the Orange County Appellate Court has accomplished through its opinion what the California Legislature has not been able to accomplish, i.e. to clarify that (1) homeowners may make partial payments (2) at any point during the collection process; that (3) payments shall not be rejected by either the association or its debt collector and (4) payments shall be correctly applied to the homeowner’s account per the prescriptions of state statute Civil Code §1367.4(b)

AB2846/Feuer (Paying Disputed Sums Under Protest); AB2502/Brownley and SB561/Corbett (Partial Payments issue.)

⁷ Now in Congress and representing the 26th District.

⁸ “Does the Punishment Fit the Offense?” February 17, 2004, Senate Housing Hearings on association foreclosures. Background paper by Senate Housing Chief Consultant Mark Stivers; Mark.Stivers@sen.ca.gov. See Sacramento Bee, “Couple Lose Their Home Over a \$120 Debt,” January 24, 2004.

⁹ The thresholds are reflected in the *Huntington* decision: (1) either the debt comprises \$1800 in assessments only (collection costs are excluded) OR (2) the assessment debt has been owed 12 months or more. See 2006 statutes.

¹⁰ In the 2010 and the 2011 Legislative sessions.

¹¹ Congresswomen Jackie Speier submitted two-page letters of support for both AB2502 and SB561. These are posted on the CCHAL website.

¹² Posted on the CCHAL website.

¹³ In its letter of opposition to SB561, ALS states that it has open at any one time 4000 homeowner accounts alleged to be delinquent.

Orange County Appellate Court
The Honorable Craig L. Griffin, Presiding
Huntington Town Homes v Miner
October 10, 2013

HUNTINGTON ADVANCES CLARIFICATION OF A STATUTE AND PROVIDES GUIDANCE FOR LOWER COURTS.

As explained in the preceding sections, the homeowner association industry and assessment debt collectors are operating under an interpretation of portions of section Civil Code §1367.4 that the *Huntington* decision finds to be erroneous. So far as the Center is aware, *Huntington* is the first written decision to correct this erroneous interpretation of the state statutes governing partial payments and the correct application of those payments.

At a minimum, publication of this decision will provide guidance to trial courts throughout the state as they contemplate the assessment collection cases brought before them. The *Huntington* ruling will be particularly crucial for guiding the officers of small claims courts where many of assessment collection cases originate.¹⁴ The Center is aware that the problem of limited time and resources is particularly acute when the judicial officer is a volunteer *pro tem* judge.

The statutes governing assessment collection and foreclosure are complex and not susceptible to quick study. They involve not only Davis-Stirling, the body of statutes governing common interest developments, but also involve the identical foreclosure statutes used by lending institutions.¹⁵ Therefore the guidance provided by publication of *Huntington* will be very helpful to all California courts hearing cases involving assessment collection and the issue of partial payments.

We also want to emphasize the scope of the assessment collection issue throughout the entire state. When Congresswoman Speier introduced her legislation, AB1317, California had 30,000 associations; now it has 50,000. One in four Californians – 25% of the state's population --lives in them. Associations collect about \$200 million annually in assessments and control now about \$10 billion in cash.¹⁶ As *Huntington* illustrates – and as CCHAL, Sentinel Fair Housing, and the State Legislature have documented – assessment collection practices do not always comply with existing state statutes.

For the reasons stated in our letter, we respectfully request that *Huntington* be certified for publication.

Sincerely,



Marjorie Murray, President
Center for California Homeowner Association Law, a 501c3 nonprofit
3758 Grand Avenue, Suite 56, Oakland, CA 94610
mmurray@calhomelaw.org

¹⁴ AB2846/Feuer (2008 Statutes) lets the homeowner pay disputed assessments and charges under protest and then file in small claims to recover sums not exceeding the small claims court limit. The measure was supported by the California Judicial Council.

¹⁵ Civil Code §§1350 et seq and Civil Code §§2924 et seq

¹⁶ See Community Association Statistics, Levy & Company, San Francisco, CA, 2011.

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT
(Rules of the Court 8.504(d)(1))

The text of this amicus curiae letter is 1727 words as counted by Microsoft Word version 2010 word processing program.

October 10, 2013


Larry L. Schaleger

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA.

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. I am employed in the County of Alameda, State of California. My business address is 3758 Grand Avenue, #56, Oakland, California 94610.

On October 14, 2013 I served true copies of an *amicus* letter to the Orange County Appellate Court in the matter of ***Huntington Continental Town House Association v The JM Trust dated Jan 1 2005, Joseph A. Miner Trustee and Joseph A. Miner, individually*** Case Number 2013 – 00623099, filed Sept 26, 2013.

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

BY MAIL: I enclosed the document in a sealed envelope, addressed to the persons at the addresses listed in the Service List and placed the envelope for collection and mailing following our ordinary business practices. The envelopes were deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service with postage fully prepaid; letters to the Orange County Appellate Court were sent via Federal Express.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 14, 2013 at Oakland, California.


Larry L. Schaleger

SERVICE LIST

Alan Carlson, Clerk
Orange County Superior Court
Central Justice Center
700 Civic Center Drive West
Santa Ana, CA 92701

The Honorable Craig L. Griffin, Presiding Judge
Judge Deborah C. Servino
Judge Peter J. Wilson
Orange County Appellate Division
Central Justice Center
700 Civic Center Drive West
Santa Ana, CA 92701

Feldsott & Lee
ATTN: Stanley Feldsott
23161 Mill Creek Drive, Suite 300
Laguna Hills, CA 92653

The JM Trust and Joseph A. Miner
2576 Newport Blvd.
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Sam Walker, Esq.
10101 Grosvenor Place, Suite 1912
North Bethesda, Maryland 20852