IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KING

ALAN GARDNER, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated,

No. 10-2-36902-3 SEA

Plaintiff,

AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT, UNJUST ENRICHMENT, AND VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION

ACT

GMAC MORTGAGE, LLC, a foreign

v.

CLASS ACTION PURSUANT TO CR 23(b)(2) OR 23(b)(3)

Defendant.

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

I.

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff, Alan Gardner, on behalf of himself and the class of all those similarly situated, as identified below, brings this action for breach of contract, unjust enrichment, violations of Washington's Consumer Protection Act, statutory penalties and injunctive relief under Washington State law against defendant GMAC Mortgage, LLC and in support thereof states the following upon information and belief:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE П.

2. Plaintiff Alan Gardner is a resident of Bellingham, Washington.

26

- 3. Defendant GMAC Mortgage, LLC ("GMAC") transacts or transacted business within the State of Washington and, at all times relevant hereto, had and has continuous, systematic contacts in and with Washington.
- 4. Defendant does or did business in King County, Washington, and some of the acts and transactions that are alleged took place in King County.
- 5. This Court has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this lawsuit.
 - 6. Venue is proper in King County Superior Court.

III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 7. Defendant is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal offices located in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Defendant is or was an originator and a servicer of home loans.
- 8. Plaintiff and class members obtained home loans from defendant in connection with the purchase or refinance of real property in Washington, or defendant obtained the servicing rights to class members' home loans originated by other lenders. Defendant was the servicer of plaintiff's and the class members' loans at the time they were paid off, and at the time payoff amounts were requested by plaintiff and class members in order to pay off their loans.
- 9. As part of the transactions to obtain the loans, plaintiff and class members signed Promissory Notes for the amounts of the loans and agreed to secure the Promissory Notes by signing Deeds of Trust for the benefit of the lenders.
- 10. Plaintiff signed a Deed of Trust on or about June 21, 2005 pertaining to his real property and naming Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. as Beneficiary. A

copy of this Deed of Trust is appended as Exhibit A hereto and incorporated by reference herein. The Deed of Trust secured a Promissory Note signed by plaintiff in favor of Homecomings Financial Network, Inc. ("Homecomings"). Paragraph 23 of the Deed of Trust provided, under the section entitled "Reconveyance,"

Upon payment of all sums secured by this Security Instrument, Lender shall request Trustee to reconvey the Property and shall surrender this Security Instrument and all notes evidencing debt secured by this Security Instrument to Trustee. Trustee shall reconvey the Property without warranty to the person or persons legally entitled to it. Such person or persons shall pay any recordation costs and the Trustee's fee for preparing the reconveyance.

- 11. In or about June 2009, plaintiff decided to refinance his home loan referred to above in Paragraph 10. By that time, GMAC had become the servicer of the loan.
- 12. In order to refinance the home loan, plaintiff was required to pay off the loan and needed to know the amount owed thereon.
- 13. On June 1, 2009, GMAC provided plaintiff a Payoff Statement for the loan.

 A copy of this Payoff Statement is appended as Exhibit B hereto and incorporated by reference herein.
- 14. In the June 1, 2009 Payoff Statement, GMAC demanded plaintiff pay \$56 as a recording fee. Some but not all of that fee was secured by the Deed of Trust, but a portion of that fee was not authorized or required by the Deed of Trust or other loan documents for plaintiff to pay off the loan in full.
 - 15. The June 1, 2009 Payoff Statement warned plaintiff:

If the funds received are not sufficient to pay the account in full, we will utilize funds from the escrow account to complete the payoff. If there is not an escrow account, or the funds in the account are not sufficient to pay the account in full, we will return the payoff funds in the same manner as they were remitted.

The Payoff Statement further provided, "The reconveyance/satisfaction of mortgage will be forwarded to the county recorder's office after receipt of payoff funds."

- 16. Plaintiff paid the \$56 recording fee required by the June 1, 2009 Payoff Statement, some of which was neither permitted nor secured by the Deed of Trust. Specifically, defendant's cost to record the Deed of Reconveyance, which it was permitted by the Deed of Trust to charge the plaintiff, was only \$42. The excess \$14 of the recording fee was neither permitted nor secured by the Deed of Trust.
- 17. GMAC engaged in similar practices and transactions with members of the class, as described herein.
- 18. Plaintiff's Deed of Trust contains a provision requiring him to give written notice of, and the opportunity to resolve, any complaints he has concerning Homecoming's actions under the Deed of Trust or alleging that Homecomings breached any provision of, or any duty owed by reason of, the Deed of Trust. Such provision is invalid as being against public policy and is both procedurally and substantively unconscionable. The Deed of Trust also does not provide that notice is to be given to a servicer of the home loan. However, without acknowledging the validity of the provisions, plaintiff provided Homecomings and GMAC the required written notice and opportunity to take corrective action by a letter sent on September 17, 2010, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit C and which is incorporated by reference herein. Neither Homecomings nor GMAC has taken corrective action in response to this written notice.

IV. CLASS ALLEGATIONS

19. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class consisting of all persons who, within the applicable statute of limitations, paid off loans to defendant and were charged fees, except

fees for the actual costs to record the deeds of reconveyance and the Trustee's fee for preparing the reconveyances, which they paid to or for the benefit of defendant in connection with paying off a loan secured by a Deed of Trust on real property in the state of Washington where the Deed of Trust contained the following or substantially similar language:

Upon payment of all sums secured by this Security Instrument, Lender shall request Trustee to reconvey the Property and shall surrender this Security Instrument and all notes evidencing debt secured by this Security Instrument to Trustee. Trustee shall reconvey the Property without warranty to the person or persons legally entitled to it. Such person or persons shall pay any recordation costs and the Trustee's fee for preparing the reconveyance.

Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other persons similarly situated pursuant to Superior Court Civil Rule 23(b)(2) or, alternatively, Civil Rule 23(b)(3). The class that plaintiff seeks to represent is composed of potentially thousands of individuals.

- 20. Joinder of all members of the class as defined herein is impractical.
- 21. There are common issues of law and fact affecting the class with respect to the application of the law pertaining to plaintiff's contract, unjust enrichment, and Consumer Protection Act claims, and the determination of restitution and damages, because of defendant's conduct.
- 22. Plaintiff's claims alleging violations of the Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86, breach of contract, and unjust enrichment are typical of the claims of the class since plaintiff and all class members sustained damages arising from defendant's wrongful conduct in violation of law as stated in this Complaint.
- 23. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class and has claims typical of the claims of all members of the class. Plaintiff does not have interests that are antagonistic to or in conflict with those of the members of the class that plaintiff seeks to represent.

AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT, UNJUST ENRICHMENT, AND VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT - 5

- 24. The interests of the class are adequately represented by plaintiff and his counsel. Plaintiff has retained counsel competent and experienced in class and consumer litigation.
- 25. This action seeks to enjoin the practices at issue and provide for equitable restitution of fees illegally collected and incidental damages.
- 26. This action is also maintainable as a class action because the questions of law and fact common to the members of the class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members and because a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. Specifically, all four of the criteria set forth in CR 23(b)(3) have been satisfied in this case. First, the members of the class have little, if any, interest in individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions. Second, plaintiff's counsel is not aware of any other litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by members of the class. Third, it is desirable to concentrate the litigation of these claims in this forum given the judicial resources already expended in this matter and the relationship of defendant to the State of Washington. Fourth, few difficulties will likely be encountered in the management of the class action.

V. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: BREACH OF DEED OF TRUST CONTRACT

27. Plaintiff's and class members' Deeds of Trust are contracts, which define the rights of the parties including what charges, if any, defendant may assess upon payoff of the loans. The Deeds of Trust do not permit defendant to assess the fees identified herein in Paragraphs 14 and 16.

- 28. Defendant breached its contracts with plaintiff and the class by requiring plaintiff and members of the class to pay these fees at the time the loans of the plaintiff and the class were paid off.
- 29. As a proximate result of the breaches of contract by defendant, plaintiff and the class members have been wronged in that plaintiff and the class paid the fees referenced herein. Plaintiff and the class are entitled to restitution of fees illegally collected pursuant to said Deeds of Trust and other documents. Plaintiff and the class are also entitled to incidental damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

VI. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, RCW CHAPTER 19.86

- 30. Defendant's practices of requiring plaintiff and class members to pay fees not secured by their Deeds of Trust by including such fees in its loan Payoff Statements delivered to plaintiff and class members constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices, which are unlawful and are in violation of the Consumer Protection Act of Washington, RCW Chapter 19.86.
- 31. Plaintiff and the class members were required to pay the fees specified by defendant on its Payoff Statements in order for their Deeds of Trust to be reconveyed to them. Defendant's practice of requiring the payment of these fees has the capacity to deceive reasonable consumers into believing that they must pay these fees that they are, in fact, required to pay these fees before defendant will reconvey their Deeds of Trust. Therefore, these practices are unfair and deceptive under the Consumer Protection Act.
- 32. Pursuant to RCW 19.86.090, plaintiff and the class seek an injunction against defendant to enjoin further violations of the practices alleged herein together with equitable restitution, incidental damages, costs of suit and reasonable attorney's fees. Plaintiff and the AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT.

26

class also seek an award of exemplary damages in the amount of three times the amount of restitution paid.

VII. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: UNJUST ENRICHMENT

33. By charging plaintiff and the class, and by retaining the excess recording fees described herein in paragraphs 14 and 16, defendant was unjustly enriched, for which unjust enrichment plaintiff and the class are entitled to recover judgment.

RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, plaintiff requests relief as follows:

- A. That the Court certify the identified class pursuant to Civil Rule 23(b)(2) or 23(b)(3) with plaintiff as the class representative and undersigned counsel as class counsel;
- B. That the Court enter a judgment in favor of plaintiff and the class against defendant on his class claims, directing equitable restitution of fees illegally collected and awarding damages, including exemplary damages pursuant to RCW 19.86.090;
- C. That the Court enter an injunction permanently forbidding defendant from committing the practices alleged herein in the future or declare the same unlawful and award incidental damages;
- D. That the Court award plaintiff and the class their costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to RCW 19.86.090 and applicable contracts;
- E. For pre-judgment interest at the highest allowable rate on all liquidated sums, and post-judgment interest on the entire judgment amount awarded at the highest allowable rate; and
- F. That the Court award such other and further relief that the Court deems just and equitable.

DATED this 16th day of November, 2010. 1 2 SCHROETER, GOLDMARK & BENDER 3 4 Martin & Garfinkel, WSBA #20787 Adam J. Berger, WSBA #20714 5 6 BERRY & BECKETT, PLLP Guy W. Beckett, WSBA #14939 7 1708 Bellevue Avenue Seattle, WA 98122 8 (206) 441-5444 phone 9 (206) 838-6346 fax 10 WILLIAMSON & WILLIAMS Rob Williamson, WSBA #11387 11 187 Parfitt Way SW, Ste. 250 Bainbridge, Island, Washington 98110 12 (206) 780-4447 phone (206) 780-5557 fax 13 14 Attorneys for Plaintiff 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

26