1 Ronald Ryan
2 Attorney at Law
1413 E. Hedrick Drive
Tucson, Arizona 85719
(520)298-3333 fax: (520)743-1020

ronryanlaw@cox.net

5 AZ

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

AZ #018140 Pima County #65325

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA TUCSON

BARRY WEISBAND

Debtor/Respondent

GMAC MORTGAGE, LLC, MOVAN

Case No: 09-5175-TUC-EWH

GMAC MORTGAGE, LLC, MOVANT vs.

DEBTOR'S MOTION TO DEEM
ADMISSIONS ADMITTED, TO DEEM
DISCOVERY OBJECTIONS WAIVED, TO
COMPEL RESPONSES TO
INTERROGATORIES REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION, TO COMPLETE
DOCUMENT PRODUCTION AND FOR
ATTORNEY'S FEES

DEBTOR/RESPONDENT

Final Hearing: 11/10/09 at 2:00 p.m.

Chapter 13

16 17

18

19

20

COME NOW, Barry Weisband, Debtor, who files this Debtor's Motion to Deem Admissions Admitted, to Deem Discovery Objections Waived, to Compel Responses to Interrogatories Requests for Production, to Complete Document Production and for Attorney's Fees, and presents unto the Court as follows:

21

22

23

24

25

26

1. This Motion pertains to the Motion to Lift Stay filed by GMAC Mortgage, LLC ("GMACM"). A certification of attempt to negotiate a resolution in good faith is included at the end of this Motion. Most of the matters are not the kind of thing for which a negotiated resolution is possible, because they are requests for recognition of consequences that operate as a matter law. The exhibits are to be considered as set forth at length herein. The Court's Docket is attached as Exhibit A and the Timeline prepared by Debtor is attached as Exhibit

2728

B. The Debtors Requests for Admission, Interrogatories and Requests for Production to

Movant filed by Ronald Ryan of Ronald Ryan, P.C. ("D's Counsel") on behalf of Debtor was served on Movant's Attorney by email and fax on 8/15/09. The Notice of Service and Certificate of Service of same is attached as Exhibit C and the Discovery requests themselves are attached as Exhibit D. These were acknowledged as received in Exhibit E. Attached as Exhibit E is a copy of emails back and forth the substance of which, in part, extended the discovery deadline to 9/29/09 by D's Counsel as a courtesy. The emails in Exhibit E began on 9/11/09. When printing out emails that are sent back and forth between two or more parties, they are printed contiguously, with the earliest email being at the bottom and the latest on top.

- 2. The Motion for Relief from Stay filed by Josephine Piranio of Pite Duncan, LLP on behalf of GMACM as to Debtor's Residence, located at 5424 East Placita Apan, Tucson, Arizona 85718 ("Residence"), was filed on 5/29/09.
- 3. Bankruptcy Rule (BR) 7036, Requests for Admission, provides that Federal Rule (FRCP) 36 applies in adversary proceedings, and to contested matters. FRCP 36(a)(3), Requests for Admission, Time to Respond, Effect of Not Responding, provides:

A matter is admitted unless, within 30 days after being served, the party to whom the request is directed serves on the requesting party a written answer or objection addressed to the matter and signed by the party or its attorney. A shorter or longer time for responding may be stipulated to under Rule 29 or be ordered by the court.

The original deadline to respond was September 14, 2009, and the request for extension of time to respond was made on D's Counsel on the same date and granted by D's Counsel on the same date, extending the deadline as to all discovery until September 29, 2009. There has been no other request for extension of deadline and none granted. Promises have been

¹ BR 9014(c) provides that rules: 7009, 7017, 7021, 7025, 7026, 7028-7037, 7041, 7042, 7052, 7054-7056, 7064, 7069, 7071, apply to contested matters.

19

2021

2223

2425

2627

28

made by GMACM of additional documentation being on its way, but no deadlines, requirements or consequences have been waived by Debtor's Counsel. Quite the contrary.² The request for extension was made by Movant's prior Attorney and the extended deadline expired 6 days prior to the entry of the Order Substituting Counsel. Additionally, to this very day there has been no response to the requests for admissions, nor objections thereto, filed by either of the Attorney's involved in the case. The date of this Motion is 35 days after expiration of the initial 30 day deadline pursuant to the Rules, 20 days after expiration of the stipulated extended deadline, and 65 days after they were first served. Accordingly, the admissions are deemed admitted. Debtor files this motion requesting entry of an order recognizing the fact that Debtor's Requests for Admission are deemed to have been admitted.

- 4. Additionally, pursuant to BR 7033, Interrogatories to Parties, FRCP 33 applies in adversary proceedings, and to contested matters, as provided in BR 9014(c). FRCP 33, Interrogatories to Parties, provides in relevant part,
 - (b) Answers and Objections.
 - (1) Responding Party.

The interrogatories must be answered:

- (A) by the party to whom they are directed; or
- (B) if that party is a public or private corporation, a partnership, an association, or a governmental agency, by any officer or agent, who must furnish the information available to the party.
- (2) Time to Respond. The responding party must serve its answers and any objections within 30 days after being served with the interrogatories. A shorter or longer time may be stipulated to under Rule 29 or be ordered by the court.
- (3) Answering Each Interrogatory. Each interrogatory must, to the extent it is not objected to, be answered separately and fully in writing under oath.
- (4) Objections. The grounds for objecting to an interrogatory must be stated with specificity. Any ground not stated in a timely objection is waived unless the court, for good cause, excuses the failure.
- (5) Signature. The person who makes the answers must sign them, and the attorney who objects must sign any objections.

² See the communication from prior counsel of GMACM, dated 9/11/09, in Exhibit E, and D's Counsel's response, dated 9/13/09, in the same exhibit.

23

- 5. There have been no answers served to a single interrogatory, nor any objections filed to any interrogatory. As stated above, it has been 35 days after expiration of the initial 30 day deadline pursuant to the Rules and 20 days after expiration of the stipulated extended deadline to answer the Interrogatories. The grounds for objecting to an interrogatory must be stated with specificity. Additionally, FRCP 33(b)(4), states in relevant part: "The grounds for objecting to an interrogatory must be stated with specificity. Any ground not stated in a timely objection is waived . . ." Accordingly, pursuant to BR 7033, BR 9014(c), and FRCP 33(b)(2) and (4), Debtor requests an Order that deems all objections to all Interrogatories have been waived.
- Pursuant to FRCP 37(a)(2)(B), Debtor requests an order compelling that all 6. Interrogatories be fully and completely answered.3 Additionally, pursuant to FRCP 37(a)(4)(B), Debtor requests that D's Counsel's reasonable attorney's fees be granted against GMACM for bringing this motion, and that such fees be in addition to the fees paid by Debtor for representation in this case, inasmuch as the work involved in bringing this motion should not have been necessary.
- 7. Pursuant to BR 7034, Production of Documents.., Rule 34 F.R.Civ.P. applies in adversary proceedings, and to contested matters, pursuant to BR 9014(c). Pursuant to FRCP 34(b) and 37(a)(2)(B), Debtor requests an order compelling a written response to each Request for Production, and an Order that the remaining documents that have not yet been produced, be produced to Movant immediately. Additionally, pursuant to FRCP 37(a)(4)(B),

³ BR 7037 and BR 9014(c), make FRCP 37 applicable to this proceeding.

⁴ The following are the documents produced, which constitute a total of 477 pages: 1) Flow Interim Servicing Agreement Between Lehman Capital, a Division of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., Purchaser and Greenpoint Mortgage Funding, Inc. Seller Dated as of April 10, 2006 Conventional Fixed and Adjustable Rate Residential Mortgage Loans (71 pages); 2) Reconstituted Servicing Agreement 1st Day of November, 2006, by and Between Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc.,

Debtor requests that D's Counsel's reasonable attorney's fees be granted for bringing this motion, and that such fees be in addition to the fees paid by Debtor for representation in this case, inasmuch as the work involved in bringing this motion should not have been necessary.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES considered, Barry Weisband, Debtor, asks that this Court enter an Order: deeming admitted the Requests for Admission; deeming all objections to Interrogatories and Requests for Production waived; compelling responses to all Interrogatories and Requests for Production and compelling all remaining documents requested to be produced; granting reasonable attorney fees for bringing this motion. Debtor requests all other general and specific relief to which he may show himself entitled under the facts as pled or proven in Court.

> Respectfully submitted, /S/ Ronald Rvan Ronald Ryan, Attorney for Debtors

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On October 19, 2009, I did email the above and forgoing to: Yaron Shaham, WOLFE & WYMAN LLP, 5 Park Plaza, Suite 1100, Irvine, California, 92614-5979; Chapter 13 Trustee; and Debtor.

/s/ Ronald Ryan

Ronald Ryan

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

and Greenpoint Mortgage Funding, Inc. Acknowledged by Aurora Loan Services LLC, ("Aurora") and U.S. Bank National Association (the "Trustee")(43 pages); 3) Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., Seller and Structured Asset Securities Corporation, Depositor Mortgage Loan Sale and Assignment Agreement, Dated as of November 1, 2006 GreenPoint Mortgage Funding Trust (Mortgage Pass-Through Certificates, Series 2006-AR7)(20 pages); 4) GMAC Mortgage, LLC, as Servicer and Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., As Seller and Aurora Loan Services LLC, as Master Servicer Greenpoint Mortgage Funding Trust Mortgage Pass-through Certificates, Series 2006-AR7 Securitization Servicing Agreement, Dated as of November 1,2006(105 pages); 5) Structured Asset Securities Corporation, as Depositor, Aurora Loan Services LLC, as Master Servicer, and U.S. Bank National Association, As Trustee Trust Agreement Dated November 1, 2006 GreenPoint Mortgage Funding Trust Mortgage Pass-through Certificates, Series 2006-AR7 (238 pages).

Page 5 of 7

Attorney at Law
1413 E. Hedrick Drive
Tucson, Arizona 85719
(520)298-3333 fax: (520)743-1020
ronryanlaw@cox.net
AZ #018140 Pima County #65325

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

27

28

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA TUCSON

BARRY WEISBAND

Debtor/Respondent

GMAC MORTGAGE, LLC, MOVANT

vs.

DEBTOR/RESPONDENT

Case No: 09-5175-TUC-EWH

CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH
EFFORT TO CONSULT TO RESOLVE
DISCOVERY DISPUTES

Chapter 13

STATE OF ARIZONA

COUNTY OF PIMA

"I swear under penalty of perjury that the following is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. Because of the fact that GMACM, hopefully without the prior knowledge of their former Attorneys, were misleading and committing fraud upon the Court and Debtor, by failing to disclose the fact that the loan had been securitized, just as Debtor's Counsel said it had at the 8/6/09 preliminary hearing, at which point this was denied or at least failed to be acknowledged, there was not much room for discussion the first time its attorneys contacted the undersigned in the 9/11/09 email. Exhibit E is a copy of emails back and forth, beginning on 9/11/09 that: GMACM finally admitted that Debtor's Loan had been securitized; Pite Duncan, former Counsel for GMACM asked for an extension of discovery deadline to 9/29/09; D's Counsel agreed as a courtesy to extend to 9/29/09. The content of those emails are self-explanatory. The next contact had was with GMACM's new attorney, Yaron Shaham, Wolfe & Wyman, who had not yet been substituted in. This conversation occurred on 9/17/09. During this conversation it was clear to D's Attorney that Shaham did not understand, or was acting as though he didn't understand, what Debtor is contending occurred in this case and in all other MBS Trust cases, namely that there has been widespread intentional fraud that was pre-planned in the early and mid-1990s and placed into effect and included almost every mortgage written

Page 6 of 7

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

between 2001 and 2007. Even though the content is included in D's Response and Amended Response to MLS, D's Counsel agreed to write a summary of D's position. Exhibit F contains that summary. Shaham did not substitute in until after the extended discovery deadline had expired. There have been nice discussions in which Shaham agreed to provided documentation. It was not until after the first discussion that any documentation had been provided, subsequent to which there was documentation provided pertaining to the Mortgage Backed Securities ("MBS") Trust in which Debtor's loan had been included in the Pool of mortgages. This was the only time that documentation was ever provided, and the only response to all of D's Discovery requests. Most of the documentation has not been produced, as of the date hereof, even though other items have been promised. Also, even though Shaham agreed to produced documentation and did provide some, GMACM was required to produce as well as to respond to the Interrogatories. It is not D's Counsel's responsibility to offer any concessions in exchange for GMACM doing what it is required to do. Debtor's counsel never made any further deadline extensions, nor waived any rights, other than to agree to a continuance of the 10/5/2009 final hearing on the Motion for Relief from Stay, because of the volume of documents produced and to be produced. Despite the above efforts the issues raised in this motion have not been resolved.

the early and mid-1990s and placed into effect and included almost every mortgage written

"Declarant has nothing further to add at this time.

Ronald Ryan, Declarant, October 19, 2009