



foreclosure proceeding began.

On August 5, 2011, the Plaintiff amended her complaint. Other than Plaintiff's addition of Paragraph 11, Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint for Wrongful Disclosure ("Amended Complaint") (Doc. 13) is identical to its original complaint. Paragraph 11 reads as follows:

11. That since the Defendant was not the holder of the original promissory note, it did not have the right to foreclose against the Properties.

### **LEGAL ANALYSIS**

A party "seeking damages in a wrongful foreclosure action must plead and prove that when the foreclosure proceeding was begun, there was no default on its part that would give rise to a right to foreclose." *Fields*, 295 S.W.3d at 571. Here, Plaintiff's sole claim is for wrongful foreclosure and Plaintiff only seeks monetary damages. Therefore, under *Fields*, she must plead and prove that when the foreclosure proceeding began, the note was not in default.

Plaintiff argues that Paragraph 11 states a claim as

a 'holder' or the party entitled to enforce a note must have actual possession of the original note to enforce same. If the Defendant did not possess the original note . . . it is not entitled to enforce the same. If Defendant is not entitled to enforce the original note . . . it can not declare it to be in default." (Plaintiff's Suggestions in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Strike Paragraph 11 and for Dismissal of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint - Doc. 19).

Defendant, on the other hand, argues that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint should be dismissed as Plaintiff does not contest the existence of default.

Under Missouri law, "there can be no tort cause of action for wrongful foreclosure when there is a right to foreclose." *Id.* "If the right to foreclose existed, no tort cause of action for wrongful foreclosure can be maintained." *Id.* Therefore, a plaintiff "seeking damages in a wrongful foreclosure action must plead and prove that when the foreclosure proceeding was begun, there was

