

1 **NELSON W. GOODELL, ESQ., SBN 264734**

2 The Goodell Law Firm
3 27 Maiden Lane, Suite 600
4 San Francisco, CA 94108
5 (415) 495-3950 (office)
6 (415) 495-3970 (fax)
7 nelson@goodelllawsf.com

8 Attorney for Plaintiff
9 GEOFFREY LYNCH

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

ELECTRONICALLY
FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

04/05/2024
Clerk of the Court

BY: MARK UDAN
Deputy Clerk

CGC-24-613682

GEOFFREY LYNCH

Plaintiff,

v.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.; QUALITY
LOAN SERVICE CORPORATION; JUSTIN
LUU; XIAO PING WU; and DOES 1-20,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

**GEOFFREY LYNCH'S COMPLAINT
FOR:**

- 1) **VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL
CODE § 2923.55**
- 2) **VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL
CODE § 2923.7**
- 3) **VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL
CODE § 2924.17**
- 4) **VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL
CODE § 3273.11**
- 5) **WRONGFUL FORECLOSURE**
- 6) **TRESPASS**
- 7) **WRONGFUL EVICTION**
- 8) **CONVERSION**
- 9) **INTENTIONAL INFLICTION
OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**
- 10) **UNFAIR BUSINESS
PRACTICES**
- 11) **SLANDER OF TITLE**
- 12) **QUIET TITLE**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff, GEOFFREY LYNCH ("Plaintiff"), on information and belief, allege as follows:

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 1. The Subject Property is a residence, owned by Plaintiffs, which is located at 2301 26th
3 Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94116 (the “Subject Property”).

4 **JURISDICTIONAL ALLEGATIONS**

5 2. Plaintiff GEOFFREY LYNCH (“Plaintiff” or “Lynch”) is, and was at all times material
6 to this Complaint, a resident of San Francisco, California.

7 3. Defendant, WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. (“Wells Fargo”), at all relevant times herein,
8 was purportedly doing business in the State of California as a lender and/or loan servicer.

9 4. Defendant, QUALITY LOAN SERVICE CORPORATION (“Quality Loan” or “Quality
10 Loan Service”), at all times relevant herein, has been an investor in mortgage loans in the
11 State of California.

12 5. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant, JUSTIN LUU (“Luu”), at all
13 times relevant herein, has been a citizen of the state of California.

14 6. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant, XIAO PING WU (“Wu”), at
15 all times relevant herein, has been a citizen of the state of California.

16 7. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant QUALITY LOAN SERVICE
17 CORPORATION, at all times relevant herein, has been a citizen of the state of California.

18 8. The real property that is the subject of this action is commonly known as 2301 26th
19 Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94116 (hereinafter, the “Subject Property”).

20 9. Jurisdiction of this Court over the instant controversy is based upon Cal. Civ. Proc. § 88.

21 10. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 392(a) because the
22 Subject Property is located within the jurisdictional region of this Court. Additionally,
23 Defendant’s liability to Plaintiff arose in San Francisco County, California. Therefore, this
24 Court has jurisdiction over all parties named herein.

25 11. Venue is properly placed in San Francisco County, California, pursuant to Cal Civ. Proc.
26 § 392, because this action results from a dispute over a mortgage on real property located
27 in San Francisco County. In addition, this action arises out of an offer or provision of a
28 loan intended primarily for personal family or household use in San Francisco County,
and the acts alleged in this Complaint occurred in San Francisco County.

12. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, of
Defendants DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and each of them, are unknown to Plaintiff at

1 this time, and Plaintiff therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs
2 allege, on information and belief, that Doe Defendant is responsible for the actions herein
3 alleged. Plaintiffs will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint when the names of
4 said Doe Defendant have been ascertained.

5 13. At all times mentioned herein, whenever an act or omission of a business entity is alleged,
6 said allegation shall be deemed to mean and include an allegation that the business entity
7 acted or omitted to act through its authorized officers, directors, agents, servants, and/or
8 employees, acting within the course and scope of their duties, that the act or omission was
9 authorized and/or ratified by the business entity.

10 14. Plaintiff purchased Subject Property on August 16, 2017, and held title to the Property
11 until the Trustee's Deed Upon Sale was recorded on March 17, 2023.

12 GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

13 15. In July 2012, Governor Edmund Brown signed the California Homeowners Bill of Rights
14 ("HBOR") into law. The striking urgency of the factual findings by the California
15 Legislature demonstrate how dire the current foreclosure crisis is. The Legislature found
16 that "California is still reeling from the economic impacts of a wave of residential property
17 foreclosures that began in 2007. From 2007 to 2011 alone, there were over 900,000
18 completed foreclosure sales. In 2011, 38 of the top 100 hardest hit ZIP Codes in the Nation
19 were in California, and the current wave of foreclosures continues apace. All of this
20 foreclosure activity has adversely affected property values and resulted in less money for
21 schools, public safety, and other public services. In addition, according to the Urban
22 Institute, every foreclosure imposes significant costs on local governments, including an
23 estimated nineteen thousand two hundred twenty-nine dollars (\$19,229) in local
24 government costs. And the foreclosure crisis is not over; there remain more than two
25 million 'underwater' mortgages in California."

26 16. It is essential to the economic health of this state to mitigate the negative effects on the
27 state and local economies and the housing market that are the result of continued
28 foreclosures by modifying the foreclosure process to ensure that borrowers who may
qualify for a foreclosure alternative are considered for, and have a meaningful opportunity
to obtain, available loss mitigation options. These changes to the state's foreclosure
process are essential to ensure that the current crisis is not worsened by unnecessarily

1 adding foreclosed properties to the market when an alternative to foreclosure may be
2 available. Avoiding foreclosure, where possible, will help stabilize the state’s housing
3 market and avoid the substantial, corresponding negative effects of foreclosures on
4 families, communities, and the state and local economy. (Assem. Bill No. 278 (2011-2012
5 Reg. Sess.), § 1 (subdivisions designations omitted).)

6 17. The legislative history of Assembly Bill No. 278 recognized extensive “‘spillover’ costs”
7 of “the foreclosure epidemic”: “By some estimates the foreclosure crisis will strip
8 neighboring homeowners of \$1.9 trillion in equity as foreclosures drain value from homes
9 located near foreclosed properties by 2012. . . . Meanwhile, state and local governments
10 continue to be hit hard by declining tax revenues coupled with increased demand for social
11 services. In fact, the Urban Institute estimates that a single foreclosure costs \$79,443 after
12 aggregating the costs borne by financial institutions, investors, the homeowner, their
13 neighbors, and local governments.” (Sen. Rules Com., Off. Of Sen. Floor Analyses,
14 Conference Report on Assem. Bill No. 278 (2011-2012 Reg. Sess.) June 27, 2012, pp. 14-
15 15.)

16 18. When a borrower is in danger of defaulting, a commonsense approach under a traditional
17 mortgage would be for the lender and borrower to mutually agree to modify the terms of
18 the loan [¶] Despite the apparent mutual interest of loan holders and borrowers, many
19 distressed homeowners report obstacles when trying to obtain a loan modification or short-
20 sale approval. (See e.g. ‘Loan Modifications Elude Local Homeowners,’ Sacramento Bee
21 (January 17, 2011).) [¶] . . . [¶] Some analysts and leading economists have cited a
22 failure by banks to provide loan modifications as a single reason that the foreclosure crisis
23 continues to drag on.¶ (Sen. Floor Analysis of Assem. Bill No. 278 at pp. 15-16.)

24 19. According to the legislative history, “borrowers can find their loss-mitigation options
25 curtailed because of dual-track processes that result in foreclosures even when a borrower
26 has been approved for a loan modification.” (Sen. Floor Analysis of Assem. Bill No. 278,
27 pp. 20-21.)

28 20. The same legislation provides homeowners who are facing foreclosure or whose homes
have actually been lost to foreclosure with a remedy if the lender or loan servicer
materially violated the provisions of the Act intentionally, recklessly, or through “willful
misconduct.” (Assem. Bill No. 278, §§ 16 & 17, adding *Civil Code*, § 2924.12): those

1 facing foreclosure may seek an injunction, while those who have lost their homes may
2 seek treble actual damages or statutory damages of \$50,000, whichever is greater.

3 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

4 21. The real property that is the subject of this action is commonly known as 2301 26th
5 Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94116.

6 22. Plaintiff acquired titled through a Grant Deed recorded on August 16, 2017, as San
7 Francisco County Recorder's Office Document No. 2017-K49580-00. As part of the
8 purchasing of the property, Plaintiff executed a first position Deed of Trust with Wells
9 Fargo Bank, N.A. in the amount of \$1,364,000.00 recorded on September 29, 2017, as
10 San Francisco County Recorder's Office Document No. 2017-K520541-00.

11 23. Defendants recorded a Notice of Default on August 15, 2022, as San Francisco County
12 Recorder's Office Document No. 2022077602, stating the amount of default was
13 \$273,468.70.

14 24. Defendants recorded a Notice of Trustee's Sale on December 1, 2022, as San Francisco
15 County Recorder's Office Document No. 2022108349, stating that the total amount due
16 was \$1,568,372.63.

17 25. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff has lost his home, as a result of his wrongful eviction
18 following the wrongful foreclosure, along with general damages.

19 26. Further, Plaintiff is entitled to an order setting aside the foreclosure sale and restoring title
20 to Mr. Lynch's name, in addition to other remedies demanded below.

21 27. On February 5, 2020, around the date Defendants executed the declaration attached to the
22 Notice of Default, agents of Wells Fargo drilled through the locks of the front door,
23 installed an interior latch to the garage door, shut off the water for the entire Subject
24 Property, stuck stickers on the toilets in the Subject Property, applied non-toxic anti-freeze
25 in the Subject Property, and applied automotive cooling throughout the Subject Property.

26 28. At the time of this unlawful entry, the Plaintiff was the sole owner of the subject property
27 and occupied the subject property.

28 29. On this point, Plaintiff never gave Defendant or anyone else his permission for their
entrance and alterations to Plaintiff's property.

30. The unconsented entrance and alterations to Plaintiff's property caused substantial harm
to Plaintiff.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.