| 1 | UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT | | |
|----------|---|---|--|
| 2 | CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 3 | 00 | | |
| 4 | In Re: |) Case No. SA09-13792-ES | |
| - | |) | |
| 5 | KAREEM SALESSI, |) Santa Ana, California | |
| | · |) Tuesday, June 9, 2009 | |
| 6 | Debtor. |) 9:30 a.m. | |
| | |) | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | HEARING RE: MOTION FOR RELIEF | |
| | | FROM THE AUTOMATIC STAY | |
| 9 | | | |
| | | WACHOVIA MORTGAGE, FSB, FKA | |
| 10 | | WORLD SAVINGS BANK, A FEDERAL | |
| 11 | | SAVINGS BANK VS. DEBTORS | |
| 11 12 | ТРАИССРТРТ | OF PROCEEDINGS | |
| 12 | | PRABLE ERITHE SMITH | |
| 13 | UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE | | |
| 14 | APPEARANCES: | | |
| 15 | For Moving Party: | MARTIN W. PHILLIPS, ESQ. | |
| | | Law Offices of Martin W. | |
| 16 | | Phillips | |
| | | 8180 East Kaiser Boulevard | |
| 17 | | Suite 100 | |
| | | Anaheim Hills, California | |
| 18 | | 92808 | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | For the Debtor: | KAREEM SALESSI, IN PRO PER | |
| 0.1 | | 30262 Crown Valley Parkway Suite B-174 | |
| 21 | | Laguna Niguel, California | |
| 22 | | 92677 | |
| 22 | | (949) 870-6352 | |
| 23 | | (515) 676 6552 | |
| 24 | | | |
| | Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; | | |
| 25 | transcript produced by trans | _ | |
| | | 2 | |

| 1 | Court Recorder: | Rick Reid |
|----|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| | | United States Bankruptcy Court |
| 2 | | 411 West Fourth Street |
| | | Suite 2030 |
| 3 | | Santa Ana, California 92701 |
| 4 | Transcriber: | Barrett Reporting |
| | | Krisha Ruvalcaba |
| 5 | | CSR No. 13255 |
| | | 17332 Irvine Boulevard |
| 6 | | Suite 220 |
| | | Tustin, California 92780 |
| 7 | | (714) 544-1996 |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | 3 |

```
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2009 9:30 AM
 1
                              --000--
 2
          (Call to order of the Court.)
 3
         THE COURT: All right. Number 42 in the matter of
 4
 5
    Wachovia Mortgage FSB versus Kareem Salessi.
         MR. PHILLIPS: Good morning again, your Honor.
 6
    Martin Phillips, for the moving party.
 7
         MR. SALESSI: Good morning, your Honor. Kareem
 8
    Salessi.
 9
10
         THE COURT: Mr. Phillips.
         MR. PHILLIPS: I've reviewed the tentative and would
11
    submit on the tentative.
12
13
         THE COURT: All right. Mr. Salessi.
         MR. SALESSI: Did your Honor receive a second
14
15
    judicial notice that I filed late yesterday afternoon?
16
         THE COURT:
                     I did. I glanced through it. It was
17
    untimely, so I'm not inclined to admit it, because that
18
    would not be fair to the other side. Let me explain, and
19
    then I'll let you address the Court, my tentative ruling
    on this, and that is: It seems to me that there's been a
20
21
    lot of litigation, based on what you did submit, that has
    gone on, with respect to this property, with respect to
2.2
    the foreclosure.
2.3
24
             And from the bankruptcy standpoint, the
    foreclosure occurred before the bankruptcy was filed.
25
                                                             4
```

```
Actually, some time before the bankruptcy was filed.
 1
                                                            То
    the extent that there are any remedies that you believe
 2
    that you have or claims that you may have against the
 3
    moving party, that litigation has already started outside
 4
    of this court, and as I understand, it had commenced
 5
    before the bankruptcy was filed. There may be matters --
 6
    I'm not sure, 'cause I've tried to figure out -- I didn't
 7
    have a complete record, but I tried to figure out what
 8
    litigation had taken place.
10
```

It seems there had been litigation in the State Court. There have been some things that have been removed in the Federal Court. There have been some things pending against -- I mean, with the Federal District Court, in terms of things that have been removed. I think there might've been some remands. I'm just trying to go by memory here.

But the bottom line is that: It seems appropriate to me that since I cannot -- first of all, I cannot overturn any rulings of the State Court or the Federal District Court, and so to the extent that there is -- there -- there's pending litigation. For example, let's start with the State Court. It seems to me that, that oughta run its course. Meaning, if you were planning to pursue any appeals, that needs to happen in the State Court.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

To the extent that there are matters pending with the Federal District Court, obviously those matters need to continue as well. And so we don't want a situation where there are inconsistent rulings, 'cause that doesn't serve anybody and -- especially if there are matters pending in Federal Court and also in the State Court, those need to resolve.

I do agree that with respect to the -- I think there was a Writ of Possession, or something of that nature, that was filed after the bankruptcy filing, clearly, that writ is null and void. And so as to that matter, Wachovia would need to restart that process. In other words, they can't use that writ at this point, because it's null and void, and I think they recognize that they can't use it, and they have to start that process all over again.

So that part I do agree with you and that -that part can be adjudicated here and I can certainly
make a determination that actions taken after the
bankruptcy was filed are gonna be null and void.

MR. SALESSI: Okay. Thank you, your Honor. May I address the fact that the -- these are not the bank and they are not -- they can't prove any beneficial interest, whatsoever, and that's also within their own communication from their inside counsel, Mr. Goldberg, in

2.2

2.3

the exhibits of, I believe, judicial notice.

2.2

2.3

And as I extensively explained there with the communication from my former request from the Treasury Department, they are not allowed -- Wachovia is not allowed to use this fraudulent name, which is one whole sentence, which says -- as a legal name in any lawsuit, in any legal proceedings, which says, "Wachovia Mortgage FSB, FKA World Savings Bank, FSB, a Federal Savings Bank." This is a fabrication, as I explained in my documents, your Honor, for -- for a few executives and attorneys in these entities to steal thousands of houses from people.

The mortgage, though, which have already been taken, initially sold by -- from World Savings Bank to Wachovia National Bank, N.A., before it changed its name. And I also provided the proof of that from the Treasury Department's web site. And they cannot bring you a single piece of proof that they have any beneficial interest. They never came up with any proof of the mortgage, with any documents pertaining to the notes. I'm talking about any original documents, deeds of trust or the notes, because they were forged back in 2002. And I don't -- I don't believe they can dare to bring any forged documents or the originals of the forged trust deeds, which were recorded here in Orange County,

across the street. I don't believe they can bring that 1 into this court and claim that this is a legitimate claim of mortgage.

And plus, your Honor, I forgot in my moving papers to use the published ruling of Honorable Judge Bufford in Los Angeles, In Re Wang, which documents, exhaustively, that the party's standing is a threshold question in every federal case and the determining power of the Court to entertain the suit.

And with that -- with that extensive discussion of Judge Bufford in that published ruling, which applies to these parties, which are a fictitious party, they have not been registered anywhere and their own governing body, Office of Thrift Supervision says that they don't exist and they aren't allowed to use this name in any legal proceedings. They cannot come up with the registration now and claim stolen properties with the trust deeds upon sale, registered under these fictitious names and backdate 'em, which amounts to thousands of houses.

And that's the reason that they are so vindictive against me, because in the federal lawsuit, I am bringing the action, as -- not only on my own behalf, but also on behalf of -- as a -- as a private Attorney General. And I am claiming the stolen houses of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

```
thousands of people by this fictitious name, which
 1
    amounts to, I believe, over 100,000 houses that they have
 2
    stolen under this fictitious name.
 3
             And this is the reason that they are so
 4
    zealously fighting me in this -- in this matter and
 5
    trying to force me out of the house to also cause me more
 6
    trauma and prevent me from their prosecution, also, as a
 7
    private Attorney General in the federal case.
 8
         THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Phillips.
 9
10
         MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, unless you have any
    specific questions, I would, again, submit on the
11
    tentative these are issues that he's raised in prior
12
13
    pending court action.
14
         THE COURT: Let me just ask you: What is it -- what
    is your understanding of the action that is currently
15
16
    pending in -- in Federal District Court?
         MR. PHILLIPS: As I understand it, he's alleging,
17
18
    among other things, the question of Wachovia's existence
19
    in its current name.
20
         THE COURT: Okay.
21
         MR. PHILLIPS: And --
2.2
         THE COURT: All right. Here's -- here's the thing:
    Mr. Salessi, as far as this motion is concerned,
23
24
    obviously there was a lot of documents that were
25
    presented in connection with this motion.
```

MR. SALESSI: Right.

2.2

THE COURT: I'm granting the motion, and I'm granting the motion, because as far as -- and I'm looking at a very narrow view of this. Foreclosure did occur, whether you believe it was valid or invalid. I already believe it was invalid, which you believe is invalid. Wachovia believes is valid. It did occur before the bankruptcy was filed. Okay? So that's already happened.

With respect to any claims that you may have regarding the validity of that foreclosure sale, it sounds as if you are actively pursuing that and nothing that I am doing today would prevent you from continuing to pursue that. But for example, as you mentioned, you've brought an action in the District Court, which apparently is still pending, and that's where that oughta be pursued.

And to the extent that there were actions pending in the State Court, that's where these issues would really need to be resolved and those courts, whether it's State Court or the Federal District Court, certainly have broader -- much broader jurisdiction than this Court does.

And some of the things that you are asserting, there may be a question about whether this Court even has jurisdiction. In particular, if there are things that

```
you are raising that would normally, for example, require
 1
    a jury trial. That raises all sorts of issues, and it
 2
    seems to me if it's already pending in -- in Federal
 3
    District Court and things have already been pursued in
 4
    the State Court, which are both courts of more general
 5
    jurisdiction --
 6
         MR. SALESSI: Right.
 7
         THE COURT: -- that's where they should take place.
 8
    So as far as this motion is concerned, I'm granting the
10
    motion and, you know, to the extent that you have
    defenses to their unlawful detainer action that you're
11
    pursuing, either in State Court or Federal Court, you're
12
13
    still free to pursue those. It's just that at this
    point, it's being taken out of the Bankruptcy Court and
14
15
    whatever's gonna happen in District Court and State
16
    Court --
17
         MR. SALESSI:
                       Right.
18
         THE COURT: -- will happen.
19
         MR. SALESSI: But your Honor, may I quote --
         THE COURT: And by the way, I'm familiar with Judge
20
21
    Bufford's decision, In Re Wang, --
22
         MR. SALESSI: Okay. Okay.
         THE COURT: -- but the difference here is that --
23
24
    and again, I'm stressing this: The foreclosure sale has
25
    already occurred --
                                                            11
```

```
MR. SALESSI: Right.
 1
          THE COURT: -- and it occurred outside the
 2
    bankruptcy and that, actually, --
 3
 4
         MR. SALESSI: Right.
          THE COURT: -- is a little different than the Wang
 5
     decision, --
 6
         MR. SALESSI: Right.
 7
          THE COURT: -- which I'm familiar with. So again, I
 8
     am gonna grant the motion. I'm not granting retroactive
 9
10
     relief, with respect to that writ or whatever was filed
    after the bankruptcy.
11
         MR. SALESSI: Right.
12
          THE COURT: That's gonna be null and void and, you
13
14
    know, you have to begin all over again on that point.
15
         MR. SALESSI: Right.
16
          THE COURT: And that will be the ruling.
         MR. SALESSI: Is my -- I have something that only,
17
    as a matter of question. What I'm seeing here is that
18
    for them to obtain relief in this Federal Court, which is
19
    like Judge Bufford's court, they must both read the
20
21
    constitutional requirement, which is the standing and the
2.2
    prudential, including the real party-in-interest matter and
    they don't have either one.
23
24
          THE COURT: Well, here's where we -- and you may --
25
     let me be very clear, 'cause you may not agree with me on
                                                              12
```

```
this one, and I understand that.
 1
         MR. SALESSI:
 2
                        Okay.
         THE COURT: But I am satisfied that they have
 3
    sufficient standing to bring this motion by virtue of --
 4
    of the foreclosure. Now, if another Court later
 5
    determines that, that foreclosure was invalid, that
 6
    ruling, obviously, will stand.
 7
             But for purposes of this hearing only, as the
 8
    party involved in the foreclosure, which did occur before
 9
10
    the bankruptcy, for this motion, I am finding that they
    have standing to bring it as the parties who conducted
11
    the foreclosure. And we don't get into whether or not
12
13
    the foreclosure was actually valid. That's gonna be
    litigated at some point, obviously.
14
15
         MR. SALESSI: Right. But --
16
         THE COURT: Okay?
         MR. SALESSI: But your Honor, the point is: There
17
    is no such a party.
18
19
         THE COURT: I only have a little bit of time,
     'cause --
20
21
         MR. SALESSI: Sure.
         THE COURT: -- obviously there are other people that
22
    are waiting and I don't wanna be discourteous, 'cause I
23
    have let you guys go quite --
24
25
         MR. SALESSI: I understand.
                                                             13
```

```
THE COURT: -- quite long on this --
 1
         MR. SALESSI: Only one sentence.
 2
         THE COURT: -- and I understand your position.
 3
 4
         MR. SALESSI: Your Honor, may I request that your
    Honor take this under submission or a continuance by
 5
    looking, also, at the Request for Judicial Notice that I
 6
    deposited yesterday?
 7
          THE COURT: No. I'm not actually going to do that,
 8
    because I spent -- I actually -- that was delivered, I
 9
10
    think, yesterday. I reviewed a lot of it this morning.
    I don't know if I reviewed all of it, but I wanna be real
11
    clear on Request for Judicial Notice, also, because even
12
13
    amongst lawyers sometimes there's a misunderstanding
14
    about what that means, what that concept means.
             Request for Judicial Notice means that I can
15
16
    take judicial notice, but the fact that certain documents
17
    were filed with the Court, it doesn't mean that the --
    that the truth of those documents is being admitted when
18
19
    you're taking judicial notice. Okay? Unless it's a
20
    court order or something that's completely
21
    self-authenticating like that.
22
             But if it's a matter of declarations or
    statements or testimony, or whatever, that was filed in
2.3
24
    another court, I can recognize, yes, those documents were
```

25

filed with the Court, but it doesn't mean that, you know,

```
the truth or the content of those documents become part
 1
    of -- of this record, so I wanna be clear about that,
 2
    because --
 3
 4
         MR. SALESSI: Yes.
 5
         THE COURT: And I want you to understand how I
    applied --
 6
 7
         MR. SALESSI: Right.
         THE COURT: -- and how I looked at the Request for
 8
    Judicial Notice.
 9
10
         MR. SALESSI: Right.
         THE COURT: Obviously you spent a lot of time and I
11
    know this is probably consuming your life. I mean, I --
12
13
         MR. SALESSI: Right.
14
         THE COURT: -- I get that part of it, but today's
    hearing is actually pretty -- pretty narrow. And it
15
16
    seems --
17
         MR. SALESSI: Right.
         THE COURT: -- to me that whatever rights you are
18
19
    asserting can we resolved in -- in other courts. So --
20
         MR. SALESSI: Right.
21
         THE COURT: -- that will be my ruling and good luck
22
    to you.
         MR. SALESSI: And may I just object to your ruling,
23
    with all due respect? And does your Honor here entertain
24
25
    a motion for reconsideration of this within 10 days?
                                                            15
```

```
THE COURT: I -- I entertain whatever motions are
 1
    filed.
 2.
         MR. SALESSI: Okay.
 3
 4
         THE COURT: Okay?
 5
         MR. SALESSI: Okay. Thank you, your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right.
 6
         MR. PHILLIPS: A couple questions regarding the
 7
    request for 10-day waiver and binding, in spite of -- or
 8
    in the event of conversion. I don't believe that was
 9
10
    referenced in the tentatives. I wanna get that clear.
         THE COURT: I understand the 10-day. What was the
11
    other question?
12
13
         MR. PHILLIPS: Binding -- binding in the event of
    conversion.
14
         THE COURT:
                     That's pretty standard, so, yes, I'll
15
16
    grant that. With respect to the waiver of the 10-day
17
    period, I'm -- that -- that request will be denied.
         MR. PHILLIPS: And to the extent to reference the
18
19
    language about the writ being null and void, you want
20
    that specifically in the order?
21
         THE COURT: Yes. I think that would make things a
2.2
    lot clearer, so --
23
         MR. PHILLIPS: Okay.
24
         THE COURT: -- the order would say that the motion
25
    is granted. That I'm not granting the request for waiver
                                                            16
```

```
1
    of the 10-day period. And also that the document -- or
    rather the --
 2
         MR. PHILLIPS: Writ of Possession.
 3
         THE COURT: -- Writ of Possession that was filed
 4
    after the bankruptcy will be null and void, yes.
 5
         MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, your Honor. Thank you for
 6
    your patience.
 7
         THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
 8
 9
         MR. SALESSI:
                        Thank you, your Honor.
10
                               -000-
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                                             17
```