

95 A.D.3d 889, 943 N.Y.S.2d 558, 2012 N.Y. Slip Op. 03449 (Cite as: 95 A.D.3d 889, 943 N.Y.S.2d 558)

### н

Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Second Department, New York.

In the Matter of Lillian HILL, deceased.

Marcia Fitzsimmons, petitioner-respondent;

Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., appellant, et al., respondent.

May 1, 2012.

**Background:** In a turnover proceeding to recover real property, mortgager holder appealed from an order of the Surrogate's Court, Queens County, Kelly, S., denying its motion for summary judgment.

<u>Holding:</u> The Supreme Court, Appellate Division, held that fact issue as to whether mortgage holder had knowledge of facts that would have excited suspicion of ordinarily prudent person and failed to make any investigation precluded summary judgment.

Affirmed.

West Headnotes

# [1] Judgment 228 2 181(15.1)

228 Judgment

228V On Motion or Summary Proceeding
228k181 Grounds for Summary Judgment
228k181(15) Particular Cases
228k181(15.1) k. In general. Most Cited

Cases

### Judgment 228 181(25)

228 Judgment

228V On Motion or Summary Proceeding
228k181 Grounds for Summary Judgment
228k181(15) Particular Cases
228k181(25) k. Mortgages and secured transactions, cases involving. Most Cited Cases

Genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether mortgage holder had knowledge of facts that

would have excited suspicion of ordinarily prudent person and failed to make any investigation, precluding summary judgment in turnover proceeding to recover real property. McKinney's SCPA 2101 et seq.

## [2] Liens 239 🖘 12

239 Liens

239k12 k. Priorities. Most Cited Cases

#### Secured Transactions 349A 138

349A Secured Transactions

349AIII Construction and Operation

 $\underline{349AIII(B)}$  Rights as to Third Parties and Priorities

349Ak138 k. Priorities in general. Most Cited Cases

## Vendor and Purchaser 400 € 229(1)

400 Vendor and Purchaser

**400V** Rights and Liabilities of Parties

400V(C) Bona Fide Purchasers

400k225 Notice

400k229 Constructive Notice, and Facts

Putting on Inquiry

400k229(1) k. In general. Most Cited

#### Cases

If a purchaser or encumbrancer knows facts that would excite the suspicion of an ordinarily prudent person and fails to investigate, the purchaser or encumbrancer will be chargeable with that knowledge which a reasonable inquiry, as suggested by the facts, would have revealed.

# [3] Mortgages 266 5 154(2)

266 Mortgages

chasers

266III Construction and Operation

266III(D) Lien and Priority

266k152 Mortgagees as Bona Fide Pur-

<u>266k154</u> Notice

266k154(2) k. Constructive notice

and facts putting on inquiry. Most Cited Cases

Mortgagee who knows facts that would excite the suspicion of an ordinarily prudent person and fails to investigate will not be considered a bona fide encumbrancer for value.

\*558 Butler, Fitzgerald, Fiveson & McCarthy, New York, N.Y. (<u>David K. Fiveson</u> and <u>Mark J. Krueger</u> of counsel), for appellant.

Marcia Fitzsimmons, New Windsor, N.Y., petitioner-respondent pro se.

WILLIAM F. MASTRO, A.P.J., RUTH C. BALKIN, SANDRA L. SGROI, and JEFFREY A. COHEN, JJ.

In a turnover proceeding pursuant to SCPA article 21, inter alia, to recover real property, Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., appeals from an order of the Surrogate's Court, Queens County (Kelly, S.), dated April 12, 2011, which denied that branch of its motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the petition insofar as asserted against it.

ORDERED that the order is affirmed, with costs.

This appeal involves real property in Queens which was previously owned by the decedent, Lillian Hill. The petitioner, Marcia Fitzsimmons, and the respondent Brenda Watson are the surviving children of the decedent. Watson allegedly improperly obtained sole title to the subject property. In her petition, Fitzsimmons seeks, inter alia, to direct Watson to turn over the property. The petition also named as a respondent Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. (hereinafter MERS), which holds a mortgage on the property in \*559 connection with a \$215,000 loan made to Watson in September 2009. MERS moved, inter alia, for summary judgment dismissing the petition insofar as asserted against it on the basis that it was a bona fide encumbrancer for value. The Surrogate's Court denied the motion.

[1][2][3] "[I]f a purchaser or encumbrancer knows facts that would 'excite the suspicion of an ordinarily prudent person' and fails to investigate, the purchaser or encumbrancer will be chargeable with that knowledge which a reasonable inquiry, as suggested by the facts, would have revealed" (Booth v.

Ameriquest Mtge. Co., 63 A.D.3d 769, 769, 881 N.Y.S.2d 152, quoting Anderson v. Blood, 152 N.Y. 285, 293, 46 N.E. 493). A mortgagee who does not make such inquiry will not be considered a bona fide encumbrancer for value (see Vitale v. Pinto, 118 A.D.2d 774, 500 N.Y.S.2d 283). Here, MERS submitted documentary evidence in support of its motion for summary judgment which established its prima facie entitlement to judgment as a matter of law (see generally Leandre v. Sharperson, 96 A.D.2d 883, 466 N.Y.S.2d 38). However, in opposition thereto, the petitioner raised a triable issue of fact as to whether MERS had knowledge of facts of such nature that would have "excit[ed] the suspicion of an ordinarily prudent person" (Anderson v. Blood, 152 N.Y. at 293, 46 N.E. 493), and yet failed to make any investigation. Therefore, that branch of MERS's motion which was for summary judgment dismissing the petition insofar as asserted against it was properly denied (see <u>Booth v.</u> Ameriquest Mtge. Co., 63 A.D.3d 769, 881 N.Y.S.2d 152; see generally Alvarez v. Prospect Hosp., 68 N.Y.2d 320, 508 N.Y.S.2d 923, 501 N.E.2d 572).

N.Y.A.D. 2 Dept.,2012. In re Hill 95 A.D.3d 889, 943 N.Y.S.2d 558, 2012 N.Y. Slip Op. 03449

END OF DOCUMENT