



Signed: May 23, 2008

*Leslie Tchaikovsky*

LESLIE TCHAIKOVSKY  
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re

No. 07-41137 TT  
Chapter 7

CECELIA ANN HILL, etc. and  
NORMAN HENRY HILL,

Debtors.

NATIONAL CITY BANK,

A.P. No. 07-4106 AT

Plaintiff,

vs.

CECELIA ANN HILL, etc. and  
NORMAN HENRY HILL,,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM OF DECISION**

In this adversary proceeding, plaintiff National City Bank (the "Bank"), a foreclosed out former junior deed of trust holder, seeks to except its approximately \$250,000 claim from the above-captioned debtors' (the "Debtors") chapter 7 discharge pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(2)(B). For the reasons stated below, the Court will enter judgment in favor of the Debtors.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**SUMMARY OF FACTS**

This adversary proceeding is a poster child for some of the practices that have led to the current crisis in our housing market.

The Debtors bought their home in El Sobrante, California (the "House") nearly 20 years ago for \$220,000. They filed for chapter 7 bankruptcy in April 2007. After purchasing the House, as the value of the House increased, the Debtors refinanced the original first deed of trust to obtain additional cash. They also obtained a junior deed of trust, which they refinanced several times. At the time they filed their bankruptcy petition, the Debtors scheduled the debt secured by the House as totaling approximately \$683,000.

The Debtors' income was modest. Mr. Hill was a parts manager at Auto Wholesaling, earning an annual salary of up to \$39,000, depending on overtime. Mrs. Hill was self-employed, using a dba of C Ann H Distributing, distributing free periodicals for various companies. Her income also fluctuated, depending on how many companies were employing her for this purpose. According to the Debtors' Statement of Financial Affairs, filed in their bankruptcy case, in 2006, Mrs. Hill's annual gross income was between \$25,000 and \$26,000. It appears doubtful that the Debtors' combined annual gross income was ever greater than \$65,000.

In April 2006, Mrs. Hill contacted a mortgage broker, Winston Ellerbeck ("Ellerback"), seeking to refinance the Debtors' existing second deed of trust debt. Ellerback, who testified at trial, stated that he had acted as the Debtors' loan broker on five prior occasions. At that time, the second deed of trust was held by

1 someone other than the Bank. The debt secured by the second deed of  
2 trust had a balance of approximately \$100,000. The Debtors sought  
3 and obtained from Bank an equity line of credit for \$200,000, thereby  
4 obtaining approximately \$60,000 in cash after paying the cost of the  
5 refinance and other consumer obligations. They used the cash to pay  
6 off their consumer debt and to "fix up" the House.

7 In the loan application submitted to obtain this loan (the  
8 "April Loan Application"), Mr. Hill's monthly income was listed as  
9 \$8,176 (i.e., \$98,112 on an annual basis) and Mrs. Hill's annual  
10 income was listed as \$3,967 (i.e., \$47,604 on an annual basis) for a  
11 combined annual income of approximately \$12,143 (i.e., \$145,716 on an  
12 annual basis). Ellerback stated that he obtained this income  
13 information from Mrs. Hill over the phone, inputted it into the  
14 application form, and sent the application to the Debtors for their  
15 signature.<sup>1</sup>

16 In October 2006, the Debtors were in need of more cash. The  
17 Bank permitted them to increase their equity line of credit to  
18 \$250,000. This time, instead of contacting Ellerback to handle the  
19

---

20  
21 <sup>1</sup> Mrs. Hill denied having told Ellerback that her and her  
22 husband's incomes were in the amounts set forth on the loan  
23 application. She and her husband both testified that they had not  
24 read the loan application before signing it and that moreover they  
25 had never read a loan application in their lives. The Bank  
26 presented evidence that called into question the credibility of  
this testimony. In April 2006, together with the loan application,  
Ellerback sent the Debtors an estimated closing statement for their  
signatures. He had inadvertently checked a box on the second page  
of the document in a section dealing with pre-payment penalties.  
Mrs. Hill called Ellerback and told him about the error. He told  
her to cross it out and initial the change. She did so.

1 transaction, Mrs. Hill dealt with the Bank directly. On this loan  
2 application (the "October Loan Application"), Mr. Hill's income was  
3 listed as \$5,600 per month (i.e., \$67,200 on an annual basis) and  
4 Mrs. Hill's income was listed as \$10,300 per month (i.e., \$123,600 on  
5 an annual basis) for a total of \$15,900 (i.e., \$190,800 on an annual  
6 basis). Again, Mrs. Hill denied having provided this income  
7 information to the Bank.

8 The Bank did not call as a witness the individual who took the  
9 information for the loan application from Mrs. Hill. The only Bank  
10 employee who testified was Dick Eubanks ("Eubanks"), the District  
11 Manager for one of the Bank's subsidiaries. He testified that he did  
12 not know if the individual in question was still employed by the  
13 Bank. However, he noted that both this loan and the loan obtained by  
14 the Debtors in April 2006 were "stated income" loans which did not  
15 require verification of income. Eubanks testified that the loans  
16 were generated for the purposes of sale and that certain guidelines  
17 (the "Guidelines") had to be followed to render them acceptable for  
18 that purpose. He testified that the Bank followed the Guidelines.  
19 A copy of the Guidelines was introduced into evidence.

20 The Guidelines stated that, for a borrower who was employed, the  
21 only requirement was verification of employment, not verification of  
22 income. However, the Guidelines stated that a third party vendor  
23 would evaluate the reasonableness of the stated income based on job  
24 type, tenure, and geographical location among other things. No  
25 evidence was presented that a third party vendor ever evaluated  
26

1 whether it was reasonable for an automobile parts manager in the San  
2 Francisco Bay Area to earn \$98,112 on an annual basis.

3         According to the Guidelines, for a borrower who was self-  
4 employed, the Bank could choose one of three types of verification:  
5 (1) a copy of the borrower's business license, (2) a copy of the most  
6 recent month's bank statement reflecting liquidity at least equal to  
7 one-tenth of the borrower's annual income, or (3) a CPA letter  
8 verifying the existence and ownership of the business. The Bank  
9 chose the third option with respect to Mrs. Hill. With respect to  
10 this option, the Guidelines stated that: "[i]nternal  
11 procedures...[would] be performed to verify the legitimacy of the  
12 letter." A copy of a letter verifying the existence and ownership of  
13 Mrs. Hill's business was introduced into evidence. The letter was  
14 written on the letterhead of a CPA, but was signed by someone other  
15 than the CPA whose name was on the letterhead. Evidence was also  
16 introduced that the Bank had verified the existence of the CPA on the  
17 letterhead. However, no evidence was presented that the Bank had  
18 verified the identity or credentials of the person who signed the  
19 letter.

20         The only other requirements established by the Guidelines with  
21 respect to the April 2006 loan were that the collateral be the  
22 borrower's primary residence, the loan not exceed \$350,000, the  
23 borrower's FICA score be sufficiently high, and the loan to value and  
24 debt to income ratios satisfy certain criteria.<sup>2</sup> The value of the  
25

---

26         <sup>2</sup> The Guidelines require a maximum debt to income ratio of  
.45, and a maximum loan to value ratio of .899.

1 House was determined through the Bank's underwriting process. It was  
2 unclear whether the Bank performed the appraisal itself or obtained  
3 a third party vendor to do so. In April 2006, the House had been  
4 appraised at \$785,000. In October 2006, the House was appraised at  
5 \$856,000. Shortly after the Debtors filed for bankruptcy in April  
6 2007, the first deed of trust holder purchased the House at its  
7 foreclosure sale pursuant to a credit bid based on a secured debt of  
8 approximately \$450,000, no one having submitted an overbid.

## 9 DISCUSSION

### 10 A. APPLICABLE LAW

11 A creditor seeking to establish a debt as nondischargeable  
12 under § 523(a)(2)(B) must demonstrate that: (1) The debtor made a  
13 written representation of respecting the debtor's financial  
14 condition; (2) the representation was material; (3) the debtor knew  
15 at the time the representation was made that it was false; (4) the  
16 representation was made with the intent to deceive the creditor;  
17 (5) the creditor relied on the representation; (6) the reliance was  
18 reasonable; and (7) the damage suffered by the creditor proximately  
19 resulted from the representation.<sup>3</sup> In re Candland, 90 F.3d 1466,  
20

---

21 <sup>3</sup> Section 523(a)(2)(B) reads in relevant part:

22 A discharge under section 727 . . . of this title does not  
23 discharge an individual debtor from any debt . . . for money,  
24 property, services, or an extension, renewal, or refinancing  
25 in writing—

26 (i) that is materially false;

(ii) respecting the debtor's . . . financial condition;

(iii) on which the creditor to whom the debtor is liable for  
such money, property, services, or credit reasonably relied;

1 1470 (9th Cir. 1996). The creditor must prove each element by a  
2 preponderance of the evidence. Grogan v. Gardner, 498 U.S. 279,  
3 291 (1991).

4 A statement is materially false if it is substantially  
5 inaccurate and affects the creditor's decision making process. See  
6 Candland, 90 F.3d at 1470 (9th Cir. 1996). Significant  
7 misrepresentations of financial condition are generally considered  
8 material. Id.

9 A debtor's intent to deceive for nondischargeability purposes  
10 under § 523(a)(2)(B) requires either a finding that the debtor  
11 actually knew the statement was false, or can be inferred from the  
12 totality of the circumstances, including the debtor's reckless  
13 disregard for the truth. In re Gertsch, 237 B.R. 160, 167-68  
14 (Bankr. 9th Cir. 1999). Where the debtor knows the purpose of  
15 documents and that they contained statements of the debtor's  
16 financial condition, the debtor's failure to question the accuracy  
17 of the documents constitutes reckless disregard for the truth of  
18 the statements, and justifies a finding of fraudulent intent under  
19 § 523(a)(2)(B). In re Oh, 278 B.R. 844, 858-60 (Bankr. C.D. Cal.  
20 2002).

21  
22  
23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 and  
25 (iv) that the debtor caused to be made or published with  
26 intent to deceive.

11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(2)(B). The Ninth Circuit reorganized these  
factors into a seven-factor analysis. In re Siriani, 967 F.2d 302,  
304 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992).

1           Whether the creditor reasonably relied on the materially false  
2 statement under § 523(a)(2)(B) is measured objectively by the  
3 degree of care exercised by a reasonably cautious person in the  
4 same transaction under similar circumstances. See Gertsch, 237  
5 B.R. at 170; (citing In re Cohn, 54 F.3d 1108, 1117 (3d Cir.  
6 1995)). Absent other factors, a creditor's reliance on a statement  
7 of financial condition is reasonable if it followed its normal  
8 business practices. See id. Other factors that may be affect  
9 whether the creditor's reliance on its own standard lending  
10 practices is reasonable include the standards of the creditor's  
11 industry in evaluating creditworthiness, and the existence of any  
12 "red flags" that would alert the reasonably prudent lender of the  
13 possibility that the information was inaccurate. Cohn, 54 F.3d at  
14 1117.

15           When there is evidence of materially false statements made by  
16 the debtor, only minimal investigation is required by the creditor  
17 to have reasonably relied on the debtor's representation. In re  
18 Gosney, 205 B.R. 418, 420 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1996) (citing Candland,  
19 90 F.3d 1466, and In re Lansford, 822 F.2d 902, 904 (9th Cir.  
20 1987)).

21 **B. DECISION**

22           As set forth above, the Ninth Circuit has identified seven  
23 elements to a claim under § 523(a)(2)(B). The creditor seeking to  
24 except its debt from the debtor's discharge must prove each of  
25 these elements by a preponderance of the evidence.  
26



1           The first two elements of the Bank's claim were not in  
2 dispute: i.e., that the Debtors made a false representation to the  
3 Bank in writing concerning their financial condition and that the  
4 misrepresentation was material. The Debtors admitted that they  
5 submitted the October Loan Application and that the figures listed  
6 for their incomes were significantly overstated. Those  
7 representations concerned their financial condition and were false.  
8 Thus, the first element of the Bank's claim is established. If  
9 their true incomes had been disclosed, the Debtors would not have  
10 qualified for the loan. Their debt to income ratio would have  
11 exceeded the maximum permitted by the Guidelines. Thus, the false  
12 representation was material, thereby establishing the second  
13 element of the Bank's claim.<sup>4</sup>

14           The Court concludes that the Bank met its burden of proof with  
15 respect to the second and third elements of its claim: i.e., that  
16 the Debtors knew that the representation was false at the time it  
17 was made and that they made the representation with the intent to  
18 deceive the Bank. The Debtors testified that they did not supply  
19 the false figures regarding their income and did not read the  
20 October Loan Application before they signed it. As a result, they  
21 contended, the Bank failed to establish either their knowledge or  
22

---

23  
24           <sup>4</sup> The Debtors testified that they did not read the October  
25 Loan Application before signing it and submitting it to the Bank.  
26 Even if this were true, by signing the Application and submitting  
it to the Bank, they effectively made the representation to the  
Bank. Their testimony, if believed, would pertain solely to the  
next two elements of the Bank's claim: i.e., knowledge of falsity  
and intent to deceive.

1 the falsity of the representation or their intent to deceive the  
2 Bank. The Court did not find their testimony credible.

3 In large part, this conclusion is drawn from the evidence  
4 presented with respect to the April 2006 loan. The April Loan  
5 Application also contained false figures with respect to the  
6 Debtors' income. The Debtors also testified that they did not  
7 supply this income information and did not read the April Loan  
8 Application before they submitted it to the Bank.

9 Their testimony was contradicted by their loan broker.  
10 Ellerback testified that Mrs. Hill provided him with the income  
11 information. He also testified that, before signing and submitting  
12 the April Loan Application, Mrs. Hill caught a mistake he had made  
13 in one of the loan documents and called it to his attention. The  
14 Court found Ellerback to be a more credible witness than Mrs. Hill.  
15 The Debtors' lack of credibility concerning the April 2006 loan  
16 transaction undermines the credibility of their testimony  
17 concerning the October 2006 loan transaction.<sup>5</sup>

18 Moreover, the Hills, while not highly educated, were not  
19 unsophisticated. They had obtained numerous home and car loans and  
20 were familiar with the loan application process. They knew they  
21 were responsible for supplying accurate information to a lender  
22 concerning their financial condition when obtaining a loan. Even  
23 if the Court were persuaded that they had signed and submitted the  
24

---

25 <sup>5</sup> The Court also found it likely that Mrs. Hill avoided using  
26 Ellerback to obtain the October 2006 loan for fear that he would  
have questioned her concerning the changes in their income figures  
as compared to six months earlier.

1 October Loan Application without verifying its accuracy, their  
2 reckless disregard would have been sufficient to satisfy the third  
3 and fourth elements of the Bank's claim. See Oh, 278 B.R. at 858-  
4 60 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2002).

5       However, the Bank's suit fails due to its failure to prove the  
6 sixth element of its claim: i.e., the reasonableness of its  
7 reliance.<sup>6</sup> As stated above, the reasonableness of a creditor's  
8 reliance is judged by an objective standard. In general, a  
9 lender's reliance is reasonable if it followed its normal business  
10 practices. However, this may not be enough if those practices  
11 deviate from industry standards or if the creditor ignored a "red  
12 flag." See Cohn, 54 F.3d at 1117. Here, it is highly questionable  
13 whether the industry standards--as those standards are reflected by  
14 the Guidelines--were objectively reasonable. However, even if they  
15 were, the Bank clearly deviated to some extent from those  
16 standards. In addition, the Bank ignored a "red flag" that should  
17 have called for more investigation concerning the accuracy of the  
18 income figures.

19       As noted above, the Guidelines required an evaluation of the  
20 reasonableness of the salary listed by an employed borrower based  
21 on job type and geographical area, among other things. No evidence  
22 was provided by the Bank that this evaluation was done.  
23 Additionally, with respect to a self-employed individual, the  
24

---

25  
26 <sup>6</sup> Given the Court's conclusion with respect to this element,  
it need not address the seventh element of the Bank's claim,  
proximate cause.

1 Guidelines required a letter from a CPA verifying the existence and  
2 ownership of the business. While the letter relied upon by the  
3 Bank verifying the existence and ownership of Mrs. Hill's business  
4 was on the letterhead of a CPA, whose existence was itself  
5 independently verified by the Bank, the letter was not signed by  
6 the CPA. The person signing the letter did not identify himself as  
7 a CPA and may not even have been an employee of the CPA on whose  
8 letterhead the letter was written.

9 More important, the Bank ignored the "red flag" established by  
10 the variation in the incomes set forth on the April Loan  
11 Application as compared to the incomes set forth on the October  
12 Loan Application. The Bank employee handling the loan transaction  
13 in October 2006 knew that the Bank had made a loan to the Debtors  
14 just six months earlier and that they were now attempting to  
15 increase the amount of the loan. The employee necessarily had at  
16 her disposal the file with respect to the earlier loan. Not only  
17 were the total income figures on the October 2006 Loan Application  
18 substantially higher than the figures on the October 2006 Loan  
19 Application, the income figures for the spouses were switched. The  
20 total annual income listed for the Debtors on the April 2006 Loan  
21 Application was \$145,716. On the October Loan Application, it was  
22 \$190,000. On the April Loan Application, Mr. Hill's annual income  
23 was listed as \$98,112 and Mrs. Hill's as \$47,604. On the October  
24 Loan Application, Mr. Hill's annual income was listed as \$67,200  
25 and Mrs. Hill's as \$123,600.  
26

1 Based on the foregoing, the Court concludes that either the  
2 Bank did not rely on the Debtors representations concerning their  
3 income or that its reliance was not reasonable based on an  
4 objective standard. In fact, the minimal verification required by  
5 an "income stated" loan, as established by the Guidelines, suggests  
6 that this type of loan is essentially an "asset based" loan. In  
7 other words, the Court surmises that the Bank made the loan  
8 principally in reliance on the value of the collateral: i.e., the  
9 House. If so, the Bank obtained the appraisal upon which it  
10 principally relied in making the loan. Subsequent events strongly  
11 suggest that the appraisal was inflated. However, under these  
12 circumstances, the Debtors cannot be blamed for the Bank's loss,  
13 and the Bank's claim should be discharged.

14 **CONCLUSION**

15 While the Court finds and concludes that the Debtors made a  
16 material false representation concerning their financial condition  
17 to the Bank in October 2006, with knowledge of its falsity and the  
18 intent to deceive the Bank, the Court finds and concludes that the  
19 Bank's nondischargeability claim under § 523(a)(2)(B) must fail.  
20 The Bank failed to prove that it reasonably relied on the Debtors'  
21 false representation concerning their income, as set forth in the  
22 October Loan Application. As a result, the Bank's claim has been  
23 discharged. Judgment will be ordered accordingly.

24 END OF DOCUMENT  
25  
26

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

COURT SERVICE LIST

Joshua Scheer  
Scheer Law Group  
155 N Redwood Dr. #100  
San Rafael, CA 94903

Cecelia Ann Hill  
Norman Henry Hill  
3621 Ponderosa Trail  
Pinole, CA 94564