

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| _____                              | ) |
| CHARLIE G. HABON et al.,           | ) |
|                                    | ) |
| Plaintiffs,                        | ) |
|                                    | ) |
| vs.                                | ) |
|                                    | ) |
| MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC                | ) |
| REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC. et al., | ) |
|                                    | ) |
| Defendants.                        | ) |
| _____                              | ) |

Case No.: 3:10-cv-00191-RCJ-VPC

**ORDER**

This case arises out of the foreclosure of four mortgages. The four mortgages and the six mortgagors are otherwise unrelated. The Complaint lists six nominal causes of action as to each foreclosure: (1) wrongful foreclosure; (2) fraud in the inducement; (3) conspiracy to commit wrongful foreclosure; (4) unjust enrichment; (5) slander of title; and (6) reformation, declaratory judgment, and quiet title (prayers for relief as to the other substantive claims). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”) transferred the case to the District of Arizona (MDL No. 2119), but severed and remanded all causes of action unrelated to the formation and operation of Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. (“MERS”) to this Court. The JPML gave no further guidance as to which causes of action were transferred and which were remanded. The MDL judge began issuing periodic “partial remand orders” in groups of cases indicating those causes of action he believed had been remanded to transferor

1 courts by the JPML, and this Court deferred to the MDL judge's determinations in this regard so  
2 as to avoid conflicting rulings. In the partial remand order addressing the present case, the MDL  
3 judge determined that the following causes of action had been remanded to this Court: the  
4 portion of the unjust enrichment claim (and related prayer for relief) that did not concern the  
5 operation of MERS. Certain Defendants moved to dismiss the unjust enrichment claim to the  
6 extent it had been remanded. The parties stipulated to dismiss MERS from the case with  
7 prejudice, and the Court granted the motions to dismiss. The Court denied a motion to  
8 reconsider and granted another Defendant's motion to dismiss. The Court granted another  
9 Defendant's motion for summary judgment. The Court of Appeals has affirmed. The Court of  
10 Appeals has separately affirmed the MDL court's dismissal of Plaintiffs' transferred claims.

11           Several Defendants have now asked the Court to expunge the lis pendens recorded as to  
12 the properties of Plaintiffs Jose Portillo and Martha Lopez, and David and Tina Stinnett.  
13 Plaintiffs have filed a non-opposition.

14 ///  
15 ///  
16 ///  
17 ///  
18 ///  
19 ///  
20 ///  
21 ///  
22 ///  
23 ///

24


1 **CONCLUSION**

2 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to Expunge Lis Pendens (ECF No. 145) is  
3 GRANTED, and the lis pendens recorded as Document Nos. 3865220 and 3865221 in the  
4 Washoe County Recorder's Office are EXPUNGED.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall submit a joint status report within  
6 fourteen (14) days of the entry of this Order into the electronic docket, explaining whether any  
7 judgment remains to be entered and why the case should not be closed.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: This 29th day of July, 2014.

10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 ROBERT C. JONES  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24