

OPINION OF THE STATE APPELLATE DIVISION

APPENDIX A

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
FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

NUV 17 2023

David W. Stayton, Executive Officer/Clark of Court
By: L. Johnson, Deputy

APPELLATE DIVISION OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

U.S. BANK NA, as Successor Trustee, etc.,

22APLC00012

Plaintiff and Respondent,

Governor George Deukmejian Trial Court

No. 22LBUD00487

YURI I LEE,

OPINION

Defendant and Appellant.

Defendant¹ defaulted on the payment under a promissory note and her residence was sold in a trustee's sale, and plaintiff U.S. Bank NA, the purchaser of the premises, filed a complaint in unlawful detainer. Subsequently, plaintiff filed and prevailed on a motion for summary judgment.² The court entered judgment for plaintiff and against defendant. In this appeal, defendant raises a multitude of challenges to the judgment. As explained below, finding no error, we affirm the judgment.

1The complaint identified defendant as Yuri I. Lee. Defendant answered the complaint as Yuri Imuta aka Yuri-Imuta: Lee. The judgment was entered against Yuri I. Lee aka Yuri-Imuta Lee. The notice of appeal was filed in the name of Yuri-Imuta: Lee, and defendant's briefs are signed by Yuri-Imuta. This court will rely on the name used in the judgment.

2Alternatively, plaintiff sought summary adjudication.

BACKGROUND

2 A verified complaint filed on April 22, 2022, alleged a cause of action for unlawful
3 detainer against defendant with respect to the premises located at 5802 East Gossamer Street.
4 The complaint, in pertinent part, alleged the following. In 2006, defendant executed a deed of
5 trust in favor of Washington Mutual Bank to secure a promissory note due on the loan used to
6 purchase the subject property; in 2013, defendant defaulted on payment of the promissory note;
7 a notice of default and election to sell under the deed of trust was recorded by the successor
8 trustee; in 2020, plaintiff acquired title to the property following a nonjudicial foreclosure sale
9 executed by the successor trustee, and thereafter duly perfected title; and plaintiff caused to be
10 served upon defendant a notice to quit the premises but defendant remained in possession of the
11 premises without authorization.

12 Defendant's answer consisted of a general denial of each allegation in the complaint, and
13 raised several affirmative defenses. The affirmative defenses included a challenge that the
14 notice was invalid as to its contents and service, the complaint was unverified by plaintiff, and
15 plaintiff failed to comply with the requirements for eviction following a trustee's sale.³

16 On November 1, 2022, plaintiff moved for summary judgment, relying on the doctrine
17 of res judicata, and claiming defendant was estopped from challenging the validity of the
18 trustee's sale which had been adjudicated on the merits in prior litigation. Alternatively,
19 plaintiff maintained the supporting evidence left no doubt that plaintiff acquired title to the
20 property and duly perfected title in compliance with all statutory obligations before service of
21 the notice to quit.⁴ The motion was supported by declarations from plaintiff's counsel, process

22 | 11

23 | 111

24

²⁷ Plaintiff sought, over defendant's objection, judicial notice of various documentation in support of the motion. The record does not reflect a ruling on the requests. It was defendant's burden to press the court for a ruling. (*Haskell v. Carli* (1987) 195 Cal.App.3d 124, 129.)

1 server Damon Boykin, and realtor and manager Darren Moon,⁵ and the notice to quit and proof
2 of service.

3 The gravamen of defendant's opposition challenged the validity of plaintiff's title and
4 alleged defendant was entitled to retain possession of the property. Plaintiff's reply pointed out
5 that defendant failed to raise any triable issues of material fact to defeat plaintiff's entitlement
6 to summary judgment.

7 Both parties appeared at a hearing on the motion and offered argument. The court
8 granted the motion for summary judgment in favor of plaintiff, finding the documentary
9 evidence, which contained all the recitals required by law, proved that plaintiff purchased the
10 property pursuant to a valid trustee's sale and thereafter duly perfected title.

DISCUSSION

Verification

13 Defendant argues before this court the identical claim rejected by the trial court—that
14 the complaint was deficient on its face because it was verified by plaintiff's counsel, rather than
15 an officer of plaintiff's corporate entity.

16 Code of Civil Procedure section 1166, subdivision (a)(1)⁶ requires a complaint for
17 unlawful detainer to be verified and to state the name of the person making the verification.
18 Verification of a pleading by a corporation shall ordinarily be made by any officer thereof, but
19 verification may be executed by an attorney if the corporate party is absent from the county
20 where counsel's office is located, and the verification states that counsel is informed and
21 believes the matters therein to be true. (§ 446, subd. (a).)

22 The complaint was verified under penalty of perjury by Attorney Parnaz Parto on behalf
23 of plaintiff. The verification executed by Parto averred plaintiff "is absent from the county
24 aforesaid where such attorneys have their office, and I make this verification for and on behalf
25 of that party for that reason. I am informed and believe and on that ground allege that the

26 ⁵Moon's declaration confirmed the subject premises remained occupied following service of the
27 notice to quit.

28 ⁶All statutory references are to the Code of Civil Procedure unless otherwise indicated.

1 matters stated in the foregoing are true.” This verification satisfied the statutory requirements.
2 (§ 446, subd. (a); *Stephens v. Parrish* (1890) 83 Cal. 561, 562.)

3 *Service of Summons*

4 Defendant maintains the summons and complaint were not served in accordance with the
5 applicable guidelines. There is no merit to this argument.

6 A court acquires personal jurisdiction over a defendant following service of the summons
7 and complaint. (§ 410.50, subd. (a); *Borsuk v. Superior Court* (2015) 242 Cal.App.4th 607, 612-
8 613.) Section 415.45 authorizes service of a summons and complaint in an unlawful detainer
9 action by posting it on the premises, along with notice sent by certified mail to that same address,
10 “if upon affidavit it appears to the satisfaction of the court in which the action is pending that the
11 party to be served cannot with reasonable diligence be served in any manner specified in this
12 article. . . .” (§ 415.45, subd. (a).) The summons must be posted on the premises in a manner
13 most likely to give actual notice to the party to be served, and the summons and complaint shall
14 be forthwith mailed by certified mail to such party at his or her last known address. (§ 415.45,
15 subd. (b).) Service of the summons is complete on the tenth day after the document is posted and
16 mailed to the defendant. (§ 415.45, subd. (c).)

17 Here, the register of actions shows that a summons was filed on April 26, 2022, but the
18 document itself is not included in the record on appeal. On May 12, 2022, plaintiff applied for
19 an order authorizing service of the summons upon defendant by posting and mailing of the
20 document.⁷ An attached declaration of diligence by Boykin, a registered process server,
21 reflects four unsuccessful attempts of personal service at defendant’s address on each day
22 between April 26, 2022, and April 29, 2022. Each attempt contained notations indicating the
23 lights were on and there was no answer, and on three occasions Boykin heard noise or
24 movement inside the premises. The court granted the application and issued the order
25 authorizing service by posting and mailing.

26 ///

27

28 ⁷The application was included in plaintiff’s November 1, 2022-filed pleadings.

1 Plaintiff filed a proof of service on June 17, 2022, reflecting that one week prior to that
2 date, Boykin executed service of all the required documentation, including the summons and
3 complaint, by posting a copy on the front door of defendant's residence and thereafter mailing a
4 copy to defendant's address. Defendant's answer admits she received the summons and
5 complaint documents which were attached to the front door on June 10, 2022, while claiming
6 they were illegible due to rain. Defendant failed to defeat the presumption that Boykin's
7 official duty was performed. (Evid. Code, § 647.) There is no doubt from the record that the
8 court acquired personal jurisdiction over defendant following service of the summons and
9 complaint by a registered process server, and with preauthorization from the court pursuant to
10 section 415.45.

11 *Service of Notice to Quit*

12 Defendant challenges the court's jurisdiction based on the claim that service of the
13 notice to quit was invalid.

14 The purchaser of real property following a foreclosure sale may utilize the unlawful
15 detainer procedures when a person holds over and continues in possession of the property after
16 service of written notice to quit the property is made upon the defendant in accordance with
17 section 1162. (§ 1161a, subd. (b).) Service in compliance with the statutory mandates is a
18 prerequisite to a judgment for unlawful detainer. (*The Bank of New York Mellon v. Preciado*
19 (2013) 224 Cal.App.4th Supp. 1, 6 (*Preciado*)). Section 1162 permits service of a notice to
20 quit, if a person of suitable age or discretion cannot be located at the residence, by posting the
21 notice in a conspicuous place on the property and sending a copy to the recipient through the
22 mail. (§ 1162, subd. (a)(3); *Liebovich v. Shahrokhkhany* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 511, 513-514.)

23 In the case *sub judice*, the complaint alleged service of the notice by Boykin. Plaintiff
24 submitted a proof of service executed by Boykin on January 4, 2022, alleging that on December
25 30, 2021, Boykin attempted personal service of the notice at defendant's residence. There
26 being no person of suitable age or discretion found at the property, at 6:35 p.m., Boykin posted
27 the notice in a conspicuous place on the property and thereafter mailed a copy of the notice to
28 defendant's address. The proof of service was executed under penalty of perjury. Plaintiff also

1 filed, on November 1, 2022, a supplemental declaration in which Boykin averred under penalty
2 of perjury that he effected service of the notice by posting and mailing it on the aforesaid date.

3 Evidence Code section 647 establishes a rebuttable presumption of the facts stated in a
4 return of service carried out by a registered process server. (*Palm Property Investments, LLC v.*
5 *Yadegar* (2011) 194 Cal.App.4th 1419, 1427-1428.) Plaintiff met its burden of proof to show
6 valid service of the notice. (§ 1162, subd. (a)(3); see also *Liebovich v. Shahrokhkhany, supra*,
7 56 Cal.App.4th at pp. 513-514.) Defendant's reliance on *Preciado*—wherein the unlawful
8 detainer judgment was reversed due to an absence of evidence in the process server's
9 declaration that personal service was attempted before posting and mailing (*Preciado, supra*,
10 224 Cal.App.4th at pp. Supp. 7-8)—is unavailing given that Boykin's declaration averred he
11 made a "due and diligent effort and after attempting to personally serve said notice(s), as
12 authorized by . . . Section 1162," and there was "no person of suitable age or discretion to be
13 found at the property" Service of the notice to quit complied with the statutory mandates.

14 *Summary Judgment*

15 Defendant contends summary judgment was unauthorized because plaintiff failed to
16 meet its burden of persuasion that there was no triable issue of material fact, and the court
17 deprived defendant of the opportunity to contest plaintiff's claim of right to possession. Our
18 review of the record confirms summary judgment was correctly granted.

19 "Summary judgment is granted when a moving party establishes the right to the entry of
20 judgment as a matter of law. [Citation.] In reviewing an order granting summary judgment, we
21 must assume the role of the trial court and redetermine the merits of the motion. In doing so,
22 we strictly scrutinize the moving party's papers. [Citation.] The declarations of the party
23 opposing summary judgment, however, are liberally construed to determine the existence of
24 triable issues of fact. [Citation.] All doubts as to whether any material, triable issues of fact
25 exist are to be resolved in favor of the party opposing summary judgment. [Citation.]" (*Wiz*
26 *Technology, Inc. v. Coopers & Lybrand* (2003) 106 Cal.App.4th 1, 10.)

27 "The party opposing the summary judgment must make an independent showing by a
28 proper declaration or by reference to a . . . discovery product that there is sufficient proof of the

1 matters alleged to raise a triable question of fact if the moving party's evidence, standing alone,
2 is sufficient to entitle the party to judgment. [Citations.] To avoid summary judgment,
3 admissible evidence presented to the trial court, not merely claims or theories, must reveal a
4 triable, material factual issue. [Citation.] Moreover, the opposition to summary judgment will
5 be deemed insufficient when it is essentially conclusionary, argumentative or based on
6 conjecture and speculation. [Citations.]" (*Wiz Technology, Inc. v. Coopers & Lybrand, supra.*
7 106 Cal.App.4th at pp. 10-11.)

8 The summary unlawful detainer procedures are available to certain parties who purchase
9 real property following a foreclosure sale. (§ 1161a; *Preciado, supra*, 224 Cal.App.4th at p.
10 Supp. 9.) "Section 1161a provides for a narrow and sharply focused examination of title. To
11 establish that [it] is a proper plaintiff, one who has purchased property at a trustee's sale and
12 seeks to evict the occupant in possession must show that [it] acquired the property at a regularly
13 conducted sale and thereafter 'duly perfected' [its] title. [Citation.] Thus, . . . 'to this limited
14 extent, as provided by the statute, . . . title may be litigated in such a proceeding.' [Citation.]"
15 (*Yella v. Hudgins* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 251, 255.)

16 In a deed of trust, the trustee holds title and has the authority to sell the property in the
17 event of a default on the promissory note. (*Brown v. Deutsche Bank National Trust Co.* (2016)
18 247 Cal.App.4th 275, 280.) To initiate a foreclosure sale, the trustee, mortgagee, beneficiary,
19 or any of their authorized agents must record a notice of default. (*Ibid.*) "The notice of default
20 must identify the deed of trust 'by stating the name or names of the trustor . . .' and provide a
21 'statement that a breach of the obligation for which the mortgage or transfer in trust is security
22 has occurred' and a 'statement setting forth the nature of each breach . . . and of his or her
23 election to sell or cause to be sold the property to satisfy [the] obligation . . . that is in default.'
24 [Citation.] After three months, a notice of sale must then be published, posted, mailed, and
25 recorded in accordance with the time limits prescribed by the statute. [Citations.]" (*Ibid.*)
26 Compliance with Civil Code section 2924 requires the plaintiff to prove the sale was conducted
27 by the actual trustee. (*Preciado, supra*, 224 Cal.App.4th at p. Supp. 10.)

28 ///

1 Plaintiff met its initial burden of persuasion that it acquired the property at a trustee's
2 sale held in compliance with the applicable statutes. The documentation submitted by plaintiff
3 established that in an instrument recorded on August 28, 2006, defendant executed a deed of
4 trust affecting the subject property to secure a promissory note for a loan of \$536,250, issued by
5 the beneficiary, Washington Mutual Bank. The deed of trust contained a power of sale. On or
6 about November 4, 2010, JP Morgan Chase Bank, as successor in interest to Washington
7 Mutual Bank, assigned its beneficial interest in the deed of trust to the Bank of America,
8 National Association. Defendant defaulted on the payment on the note in 2013. A Notice of
9 Default and Election to Sell under the deed of trust was recorded on August 28, 2013, which
10 claimed a past-due amount of \$121,809.27.

11 On March 30, 2016, Quality Loan Service Corporation was substituted as successor
12 trustee under the deed of trust. The successor trustee recorded, on December 3, 2019, a notice
13 of trustee's sale listing the public auction date and location and reflected an unpaid balance on
14 the account of \$799,421.77. The trustee's deed upon sale recorded by the successor trustee on
15 February 10, 2020, conveyed title to the property to plaintiff—the highest bidder in the amount
16 of \$703,800—following a trustee's sale held on January 30, 2020. When a trustee's deed upon
17 sale recites that all procedural requirements for the default notice and sale notice have been
18 satisfied, there is a statutory rebuttable presumption that such notice requirements have been
19 fulfilled. (Civ. Code, § 2924, subd. (c); *Melendrez v. D & I Investment, Inc.* (2005) 127
20 Cal.App.4th 1238, 1255.)

21 The trial court relied on the aforesaid evidence in finding that plaintiff met its initial
22 burden of showing that it acquired title to the property following a trustee's sale held in
23 compliance with Civil Code section 2924, and that defendant was served proper notice, but
24 nevertheless refused to deliver possession of the premises. The evidence included all the
25 documentation required to show a legal transfer of title following a trustee's sale. This
26 evidence met the elements of the cause of action. (§ 1161a, subd. (b)(3); Civ. Code, § 2924.)
27 Unlike *Preciado*, plaintiff submitted sufficient proof that it acquired title to the property at a
28 regularly conducted trustee's sale other than the deed of trust on its own. The burden of

1 persuasion shifted to defendant to identify a triable issue of material fact as to an element of the
2 unlawful detainer action or a defense thereto. (§ 437c, subd. (p)(1); *Aguilar v. Atlantic*
3 *Richfield Co.* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 826, 849.)

4 The evidence cited in defendant's separate statement in opposition to the motion was
5 limited to defendant's own declaration, and a "declaration of registrant[.]". Defendant's
6 declaration averred, in pertinent part, "on February 4, 2020, I received a confirmation email
7 from the appointed auctioneer of the trustee sale scheduled for January 31, 2020 stating that the
8 auction was cancelled"; "On a late rainy evening of December 30, 2021, I noticed a paper
9 posted on the front door window" which ripped and was not legible; on December 31, 2021,
10 defendant sent a letter by certified mail to the "signor of the paper(s), asking for clarification by
11 mail," but she never received a response and was never served personally or by mail the notice
12 to quit.⁸ The attached email received from "nwolnisty@auction.com" stated in its entirety,
13 "Thank you for your email. The auction has been cancelled. Regards, the Auction.Com
14 Team."

15 The "declaration of registrant" was purportedly executed by Andrew Kazunari Imuta
16 Lee, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Nevada. The declaration averred in
17 pertinent part: "Per Cal. Civ. Code § 1487, I assigned the Eligible Obligation / Bank Note to
18 Yuri I. Lee, for the purpose of Cal. Com Code§ 3311 (a)(b) / §3603 (b)—Uniform Commercial
19 Code§ 3-311 (a)(b) / §3-603 (b)—for the fair market value or above fair market value, or SUM
20 CERTAIN as reflected on the debt / outstanding obligation, all parts and portions, all amount,
21 ending in a zero (-0-) ending balance, and for no other purpose. [¶] The instrument titled
22 Notice of Assignment of Eligible Obligation with MICR and other pertinent numbers allowing
23 monetization of said Bank Note was signed by me before a notary public on February 4, 2020."
24 (*Sic.*)

25 ///

26 ///

27
28 ⁸The caption of the letter stated: "Admissible Notice of Refusal for Cause Without Dishonor
Notice to agent is notice to principal . . . Actual and Constructive Notice . . ." (*Sic.*)

1 The evidence cited by defendant did not contain specific facts that give rise to a triable
2 issue of material fact as to any element of the cause of action or a defense thereto. (See *First*
3 *American Title Insurance Co. v. Spanish Inn, Inc.* (2015) 239 Cal.App.4th 598, 605-606.)
4 Defendant's declaration does not refute the pertinent evidence relied upon by plaintiff, and the
5 "declaration of registrant" by Lee is unintelligible and of no evidentiary value. There is no
6 explanation as to the purported role of Auction.com in the trustee's sale. An opposition to
7 summary judgment based on conjecture will not be successful. (*Wiz Technology, Inc. v.*
8 *Coopers & Lybrand, supra*, 106 Cal.App.4th at p. 11; *MRI Healthcare Center of Glendale, Inc.*
9 *v. State Farm General Insurance Co.* (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 766, 777.) The party moving for
10 summary judgment has no obligation to refute assertions in the opposition which are
11 unintelligible. (*Leek v. Cooper* (2011) 194 Cal.App.4th 399, 412.) There are no triable issues
12 of material fact concerning whether plaintiff acquired the property following a trustee's sale
13 held in compliance with Civil Code section 2924 and whether defendant was served with the
14 requisite notice. Defendant's failure to rebut the burden of persuasion justified summary
15 judgment.⁹

16 ⁹Defendant raised these same claims in an unlimited civil action filed in 2017, claiming breach
17 of contract and seeking declaratory relief. (Docket no. NC061515.) This action was removed to the
18 United States Bankruptcy Court. The bankruptcy court on July 30, 2018, granted a motion to dismiss
19 the complaint, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment of dismissal. It is
20 plaintiff's position that this judgment precludes defendant's challenge to the validity of title in this
21 proceeding under the doctrine of res judicata. Plaintiff is incorrect. Res judicata applies only when
22 there was a final judgment on the merits of a prior adjudication involving identical issues. (*Consumer*
23 *Advocacy Group, Inc. v. ExxonMobil Corp.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 675, 685-686.) The judgment of
24 dismissal entered by the federal court in 2019 was not an adjudication on the merits of the validity of
25 the trustee's sale in 2020.

26 On the day of oral argument in this appeal, defendant sought a continuance of argument. The
27 request was denied as untimely and for want of adequate notice to plaintiff. (Cal. Rules of Court, rules
28 Rule 8.885(a)(1), 8.808.)

29 Also on the day of oral argument, defendant filed a pleading entitled "Rule 8.54 Motion and
30 Memorandum in Support." By this pleading defendant argues the summary judgment procedure
31 violated her constitutional right to a jury trial and seeks "an order granting Motion requiring Federal
32 Rules of Civil Procedure 38(a) be followed honoring the 7th Amendment of the Constitution." The
33 motion is denied. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not apply to this state court proceeding
34 (*Bach v. County of Butte* (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 554, 561), and it has long been held that proper use of
35 the summary judgment procedure in a civil case does not violate the constitutional right to a jury trial
36 (*Scheiding v. Dimmiedie Construction Co.* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 64, 70).

DISPOSITION

2 The order granting summary judgment and the ensuing judgment are affirmed.

3 Plaintiff to recover costs on appeal.

Q. M. U. S.

P. McKay, P. J.

We concur:


J. Richardson

Richardson, J.

Ricciardulli, J.

JUDGMENT OF THE STATE TRIAL COURT

APPENDIX B

1 KAYO MANSON-TOMPKINS
2 Attorney Bar No. 136476
3 PARNAZ PARTO
4 Attorney Bar No. 276874
5 The Wolf Firm, A Law Corporation
6 1851 East 1st Street, Suite 100
7 Santa Ana, CA 92705
8 Ph: (949) 720-9200; Fax: (949) 608-0131

9 Attorney for Plaintiff

10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

12 U.S. BANK NA, SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE TO
13 BANK OF AMERICA, NA, SUCCESSOR IN
14 INTEREST TO LASALLE BANK NA, AS
15 TRUSTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE HOLDERS
16 OF THE WAMU MORTGAGE PASS-
17 THROUGH CERTIFICATES, SERIES 2006-
18 AR12

19 Case No.: 22LBUD00487

20 {PROPOSED}
21 JUDGMENT

22 Date: November 10, 2022
23 Time: 8:30 a.m.
24 Dept: S26

25 Complaint Filed: April 22, 2022

26 Plaintiff,
27 vs.
28 YURI I. LEE, and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

29 Defendant.

30 This court, having on Nov. 22, 2022 granted the motion of Plaintiff for Summary
31 Judgment, and having ordered the entry of judgment as requested in said motion,
32 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT Plaintiff U.S. BANK NA,
33 SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE TO BANK OF AMERICA, NA, SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO
34 LASALLE BANK NA, AS TRUSTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE HOLDERS OF THE WAMU
35 MORTGAGE PASS-THROUGH CERTIFICATES, SERIES 2006-AR12 have and recover from
36 Defendant YURI I. LEE aka YURI-JMUTA LEE ("Defendant") possession of the improved real
37 property located at 5802 East Gossamer Street, Long Beach, CA 90808, together with detached garage
38

Order Summary Judgment.
6401-47498

1 and separate structures, if any ("Premises"). The clerk of this Court is directed to issue a writ of
2 possession directing the sheriff to take all legal steps necessary to remove Defendant from the
3 Premises.

4
5 Dated: 11/22/2022

6 
7 (JUDGE) (COMMISSIONER) OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
134

DECISION OF THE STATE APPELLATE COURT DENYING REVIEW

APPENDIX C

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

COURT OF APPEAL - SECOND DIST.

DIVISION ONE

FILED

Feb 23, 2024

EVA MCCLINTOCK, Clerk

Julietta Lozano Deputy Clerk

U.S. BANK NA, Successor Trustee to
BANK OF AMERICA, NA, Successor
in Interest, etc.,

B335151

(Super. Ct. L.A. County
No. 22LBUD00487)

Plaintiff and Respondent,

(App. Div. Case No. 22APLC00012)

v.

YURI I. LEE,

ORDER

Defendant and Appellant.

THE COURT*:

The petition for review, filed February 15, 2024, has been read and considered.

It appearing that petitioner seeks review of this Court's January 10, 2024 Memorandum of No Transfer denying petitioner's request to transfer to this Court an appeal decided by the Appellate Division of the Superior Court, the petition is denied without prejudice to petitioner's filing the petition in the California Supreme Court.

FR Rothschild

*ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

Chaney

CHANAY, J.

Bendix

BENDIX, J.

**DECISION OF THE STATE SUPREME COURT DENYING REVIEW
AFTER CORRECTION TO THE EARLIER ORDER MADE BY THE APPELLATE
COURT**

APPENDIX D

FILED
Mar 12, 2024

EVA MCINTOCK, Clerk
Aracelia Lopez, Deputy Clerk

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

U.S. BANK NA, Successor Trustee to
BANK OF AMERICA, NA, Successor
in Interest, etc.,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

YURI I. LEE,

Defendant and Appellant.

B335151

(Super. Ct. L.A. County
No. 22LBUD00487)

(App. Div. Case No. 22APLC00012)

ORDER

THE COURT*:

The order issued February 23, 2024, is corrected nunc pro tunc to delete "the petition is denied without prejudice to petitioner's filing the petition in the California Supreme Court" and replace it with "the petition is denied. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.1018 [If the Court of Appeal denies transfer of a case from the appellate division of the superior court ... after a party files a petition for transfer, the denial is final immediately.'].)"

FRothschild

*ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

Chaney

CHANAY, J.

Bendix

BENDIX, J.



Supreme Court of California

JORGE E. NAVARRETE
CLERK AND EXECUTIVE OFFICER
OF THE SUPREME COURT

EARL WARREN BUILDING
359 McALLISTER STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
(415) 665-7800

March 12, 2024

Yuri Imuta
5802 East Gossamer Street
Long Beach, CA 90808

Re: U.S. Bank NA v. LEE - B335151

Dear Mrs. Lee,

Your petition for review received electronically on March 7, 2024, regarding the above referenced matter, cannot be filed.

A party may file a petition in the Supreme Court for review of any decision of the Court of Appeal, including any interlocutory order, except the denial of a transfer of a case within the appellate jurisdiction of the superior court. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rules 8.500(a)(1), 8.1018(a).) The Court of Appeal order denying transfer was final immediately and cannot be reviewed. Without jurisdiction, this court is unable to consider your request for legal relief.

Very truly yours,

JORGE E. NAVARRETE
Clerk and
Executive Officer of the Supreme Court

Zenete Ali
By: Z. Ali, Assistant Deputy Clerk

cc: rec

Enclosure

APPENDIX D