AMERICAN BANKER®
THE FINANCIAL SERVICES DAILY
Tuesday, October 19, 2010

VIEWPOINT

Title Transfer Law 101

BY KAREN GELERNT

Recently, commentators have raised questions about whether certain transfers of residential mortgage loans (made in connection with secondary market transactions such as securitizations) were sufficient to transfer title to the new owner of the mortgage loans and whether such transfers of rights were sufficient to allow the new owner of the mortgages to commence foreclosure, where appropriate.

To better understand these issues, they must be put in their proper perspective based upon the law that underlies transfers of mortgage loans. The underlying tenet, however, is that residential mortgage notes are negotiable instruments which, by their nature, are intended to be liquid and easily transferable by certain key actions outlined in the law. Challenging this notion, irresponsibly questions a well-established body of law affecting trillions of dollars of mortgage loans as well as trillions of dollars of other types of negotiable instruments.

A mortgage loan consists of two important documents: the mortgage note, which constitutes the obligation of the mortgagor to pay its loan; and the mortgage, that constitutes the lien on the real property that secures the note. The note is a promissory note and notes secured by homes are typically negotiable instruments under law. Negotiable instruments have certain special characteristics under law. First, they are easily transferable (typically by endorsement).

Second, a holder in due course of a negotiable instrument takes the instrument free of most defenses to payment, thereby permitting the holder prompt payment. The intent behind the law of negotiable instruments was to enable such instruments to be as liquid as possible, to encourage commerce and lending. As such, residential mortgage loans are intended to be relatively liquid assets, easily transferred and easily realized upon.

In this way, a residential mortgage note is analogous to a check. In the case of the mortgage note, it is payable to the order of a mortgagee. Similar to a check, which is transferred by endorsement, a mortgage note is also transferred by endorsement. An endorsement can be specific (such as "Pay to the order of Joe Smith") or can be blank (such as "Pay to the order of ______"). When a note is endorsed in blank, it becomes bearer paper (in other words, the bearer, or holder, is presumed to be the owner). The analogy would be a check made out to "cash." In both instances, the instrument can be physically transferred multiple times without the requirement of additional endorsements. If you presented a bank with a check made out to "cash" the bank should not question your ownership. Similarly, the ownership by an entity of a mortgage note endorsed in blank should not, in the ordinary course, be challenged.

In other words (and aside from the separate issue of whether the circumstances that are required to commence foreclose exist with respect to the mortgage loan), mere possession of a promissory note endorsed in blank (whether a check or a mortgage note) should provide the presumption of ownership of that promissory note by the current holder. So for example, a trustee for a securitization that has physical possession of the mortgage note, should be the presumed owner of that note. Any other outcome would put at risk the entire premise and foundation of negotiable instruments law.

In the end, an endorsement in blank does not, and should not, raise a question of ownership of the instrument.

The second component of a mortgage loan is the mortgage. The mortgage and the transfer of mortgage is governed by real property law. The mortgage must be recorded to put third parties on notice of the lienholder. This protects the mortgagee as well as other parties that might assert an interest in the property, like other lenders, judgment creditors or potential purchasers of the property. It protects the mortgagee because, if a third party were to assert an interest in the real property it would be required to give notice to all the interested parties of record, including the mortgagee of record under the mortgage. If an assignee did not record an assignment of mortgage, then the assignee would not be put on notice. However, this would be a risk borne by the assignee.

Historically, when a mortgage loan was transferred it was accompanied by an assignment of mortgage, oftentimes in blank. Because the secondary market was so active, buyers of mortgage loans frequently did not record the assignments in blank and merely delivered the assignments with the related mortgage notes endorsed in blank to the subsequent buyer. Frequently, the servicer of the mortgage loans remained the mortgagee of record and would receive any important notices regarding the related mortgaged properties. However, in order to facilitate easy transfers of mortgage loans, and to ease the burden of multiple recordations of assignments of mortgage in an active secondary market, MERS systems was developed. MERS is basically an agent for the mortgagee of record. So while a mortgage note may be transferred several times the mortgagee of record remains MERS and MERS tracks the intended mortgagee in its systems.

But at the end of the day, it is the owner of the mortgage note that dictates ownership of the mortgage (a premise commonly referred to as "the mortgage follows the note") as evidenced by Article 3 and Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code, in effect in all states.

Ideally, at foreclosure, the mortgagee of record should correspond to the holder of the note. However, any disparity should not be an acceptable basis to bar foreclosure, since the mortgage should not be the document that is dispositive of title to the mortgage loan. The holder of the note should be deemed the owner of the mortgage loan with standing and right to foreclose.

The chain of assignment of the mortgage may for various reasons be defective, or in the case of MERS, an agent for the holder may be identified as the mortgagee, but the principles of commercial law and negotiable instruments, if applied correctly, should ultimately prevail and allow the holder of the note to foreclose to the extent permitted by the mortgage loan documents and applicable state law. Any other outcome would call into question the foundations and liquidity of negotiable instruments and severely obstruct what was always intended as a relatively liquid market.

Karen Gelernt is a partner in the capital markets department at Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft.