

Daily Development for Thursday, September 2, 2010

by: Patrick A. Randolph, Jr.

Elmer F. Pierson Professor of Law

UMKC School of Law

Of Counsel: Husch Blackwell Sanders

Kansas City, Missouri

[dirt@umkc.edu](mailto:dirt@umkc.edu)

**BANKRUPTCY; AVOIDANCE; DEFECTIVE NOTARIZATION:** Although a secured claim may be represented by a defectively notarized instrument, the Trustee may not avoid the claim if there is another basis for constructive notice, such as a recorded notice of default, in the record.

BowlNebraska LLC v. Omaha State Bank (In re BowlNebraska), (MLW No. /Case No. 10-6016 - 8 pages) (U.S. Bankruptcy Appellate Panel, 8th Circuit, Federman, J.) (7/1/10) (no Westlaw cite could be found)

A principal of debtor, prior to bankruptcy, had executed and recorded a series of notes and modifications of notes, all secured by deeds of trust, to Bank. The principal's signature on all these documents was notarized by a the bank's president, who was a licensed notary, but was also the brother in law of the principal.

One of the deeds of trust (the first one) had also been executed by another officer of the Debtor, but the signature was also notarized by the brother in law of his co-signor.

Under Nebraska law, a notary is disqualified from performing notarial functions "if the notary is a spouse, ancestor, descendent, or sibling of the principal, including in-law, step, or half relatives." Further, an improperly notarized document does not provide constructive notice under Nebraska law. The lower courts upheld the avoidance, even of the first deed of trust, since they ruled that the "infection" of the brother in law also disqualified him from notarizing another signature on the same document.

When Debtor went bankrupt, the Trustee attempted to avoid the various mortgages on the basis that the Debtor was a "hypothetical BFP" and took free of all liens not properly recorded. The BAP agreed with this analysis, but took the case a step further, reversing the lower courts on the grounds that the Trustee had an alternate form of constructive notice of the liens.

The BAP noted that the Bank had recorded properly notarized notices of default on all the relevant secured claims before the filing of the bankruptcy. The court commented:

"[E]ven assuming for these purposes that the recorded deeds of trust did not provide constructive notice of the Bank's liens, the notices of default constitute suspicious circumstances which would put a prudent person on inquiry that the Bank claimed an interest in [Debtor's] prooperty. In addition, Nebraska law provides that a 'notice of default, . . . when acknowledged as provided by law, shall be entitled to be recorded, and shall, from the time of filing the same with the register of deeds for record, impart notice of the contents

thereof, to all persons, including subsequent purchasers and encumbrancers for value.'"

Consequently, the Trustee could not exercise the avoidance power. The lack of proper notarization of the original documents did not render them void, but only avoidable by a BFP. Consequently, since the Trustee was not a BFP due to the recorded notices, the claims would bind the estate.

Comment: The case provides an excellent tactic for avoiding the "faulty notarization" trap that is cropping up around the country. In some cases, it might even be easier to file some instrument such as a notice of default that to try to redo and refile the original defectively notarized documents, even if the creditor discovers them.

Items reported here and in the ABA publications are for general information purposes only and should not be relied upon in the course of representation or in the forming of decisions in legal matters. The same is true of all commentary provided by contributors to the DIRT list. Accuracy of data and opinions expressed are the sole responsibility of the DIRT editor or individual contributors and are in no sense the publication of the ABA.

Parties posting messages to DIRT are posting to a source that is readily accessible by members of the general public, and should take that fact into account in evaluating confidentiality issues.

ABOUT DIRT:

DIRT is an internet discussion group for serious real estate professionals. Message volume varies, but commonly runs 5 to 15 messages per work day.

DIRT Developments are posted periodically, as supply dictates.

To subscribe, send the message

subscribe Dirt [your name]

to

[listserv@listserv.umkc.edu](mailto:listserv@listserv.umkc.edu)

To cancel your subscription, send the message signoff DIRT to the address:

[listserv@listserv.umkc.edu](mailto:listserv@listserv.umkc.edu)

for information on other commands, send the message Help to the listserv address.

DIRT has an alternate, more extensive coverage that includes not only commercial and general real estate matters but also focuses specifically upon residential real estate matters. Because real estate brokers generally find this service more valuable, it is named "BrokerDIRT." But residential specialist attorneys, title insurers, lenders and others interested in the residential market will want to subscribe to this alternative list. If you subscribe to BrokerDIRT, it is not

necessary also to subscribe to DIRT, as BrokerDIRT carries all DIRT traffic in addition to the residential discussions.

To subscribe to BrokerDIRT, send the message

subscribe BrokerDIRT [your name]

to

[listserv@listserv.umkc.edu](mailto:listserv@listserv.umkc.edu)

To cancel your subscription to BrokerDIRT, send the message signoff BrokerDIRT to the address:

[listserv@listserv.umkc.edu](mailto:listserv@listserv.umkc.edu)

DIRT is a service of the American Bar Association Section on Real Property, Probate & Trust Law and the University of Missouri, Kansas City, School of Law. Daily Developments are copyrighted by Patrick A. Randolph, Jr., Professor of Law, UMKC School of Law, but Professor Randolph grants permission for copying or distribution of Daily Developments for educational purposes, including professional continuing education, provided that no charge is imposed for such distribution and that appropriate credit is given to Professor Randolph, any substitute reporters, DIRT, and its sponsors.

All DIRT Developments, and scores of other cases, arranged topically, are reported in hardcopy form in the ABA Quarterly Report. This is a limited subscription service, available to ABA Section Members, ACMA members and members of the NAR. Qualified subscribers may Subscribe to this Report (\$30 for Two Years) by Sending a Check to Ms. Bunny Lee, ABA Section on Real Property, Trust & Estate Law, 321 N. Clark Street, Chicago, Il 60610. Contact Bunny Lee at (312) 988-5651, [Leeb@staff.abanet.org](mailto:Leeb@staff.abanet.org) ABA members also can access prior and current editions of this report on the ABA RPTE section website.

DIRT has a WebPage at:

<http://dirt.umkc.edu/>