

171 So.3d 192
District Court of Appeal of Florida,
Fifth District.

Yefim VASILEVSKIY and
Yelena Vasilevskiy, Appellants,
v.
WACHOVIA BANK, NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION, et al., Appellees.

No. 5D13-3468.

|
July 31, 2015.

|
Rehearing En Banc Denied July 31, 2015.

Synopsis

Background: Mortgagee brought foreclosure action against mortgagors. The Circuit Court, Flagler County, [H. Pope Hamrick, Jr.](#), Senior Judge, granted mortgagee's motion for summary judgment, and mortgagors appealed.

Holding: On denial of rehearing, the District Court of Appeal held that mortgagee's breach of condition precedent that required full 30-day notice of default prior to acceleration did not constitute a defense to enforcement of mortgage.

Affirmed.

[Palmer, J.](#), filed dissenting opinion.

Attorneys and Law Firms

***192** [Thomas Eross, Jr.](#), [Kendrick Almaguer](#), and [Peter Ticktin](#), The Ticktin Law Group, P.A., Deerfield Beach, for Appellant.

[MaryEllen M. Farrell](#), [Michael K. Winston](#), [C. Cory Mauro](#), and [Dean A. Morande](#), Carlton Fields Jordan Burt, P.A., of West Palm Beach, for Appellee.

ON MOTION FOR REHEARING

PER CURIAM.

We deny the motion for rehearing but withdraw the original panel opinion and substitute this opinion to clarify our holding.

In this foreclosure case, we address the effect of a defective notice of default. The mortgage at issue here required that Appellee, Wachovia Bank, National Association, provide to Appellants written notice of the default and an opportunity to cure the default by a date not less than thirty days from the date of the notice. The notice actually sent to Appellants specified a cure date that was only twenty-eight days after the date of the notice. Four months later, after Appellants failed to cure the default, Appellee filed suit. Almost four years after suit was filed and shortly before the hearing on Appellee's motion for summary judgment, Appellants filed an amended answer, raising the defective notice for the first time. The trial court granted Appellee's motion for summary judgment, culminating in this appeal.

Although Appellee breached the contractual provision that required a full thirty days' notice, we conclude that the breach of contract was not material. The purpose of the notice provision is to allow the mortgagor to cure the default prior to acceleration. The shortage of two days was insignificant under the facts of this case. *See Gorel v. Bank of New York, Mellon*, 165 So.3d 44, 47 (Fla. 5th DCA 2015) (citing *Allstate Floridian Ins. Co. v. Farmer*, 104 So.3d 1242, 1248-49 (Fla. 5th DCA 2012) (breach of condition precedent must be material, meaning one causing prejudice, ***193** to constitute defense to enforcement of contract)).

Samaroo v. Wells Fargo Bank, 137 So.3d 1127 (Fla. 5th DCA 2014), is distinguishable. There, the defective notice entirely omitted the notice of a right to cure. Under the facts of that case, we were unable to conclude as a matter of law that the breach was immaterial. *See also Alvarez v. Rendon*, 953 So.2d 702, 708 (Fla. 5th DCA 2007) (party to contract must at least substantially comply with condition precedent).

AFFIRMED.

[TORPY, J.](#) and [JACOBUS, B.W.](#), Senior Judge, concur.

[PALMER, J.](#), dissents with opinion.

[PALMER, J.](#), dissenting.

I respectfully dissent from the majority's affirmance of the final summary judgment of foreclosure entered in favor of Wachovia Bank (the bank).

In order to prevail on a motion for summary judgment, a plaintiff must establish that there is no disputed issue of any material fact regarding its claim, and also must establish that there are no material issues of fact regarding any of the defenses raised by the defendant. When a party raises affirmative defenses, a summary judgment should not be granted where there are issues of fact raised by the affirmative defenses which have not been refuted. [Kurian v. Wells Fargo Nat'l Ass'n](#), 114 So.3d 1052 (Fla. 4th DCA 2013).

Here, the defendants asserted an affirmative defense of the bank's failure to fulfill conditions precedent to foreclosure. Specifically, the defendants alleged that the bank failed to comply with paragraph twenty-two of the mortgage by failing to provide proper notice of default. Paragraph twenty-two of the mortgage states, in part:

Lender shall give notice to Borrower prior to acceleration following Borrower's breach of any covenant or agreement in this Security Instrument.... The notice shall specify: (a) the default; (b) the action required to cure the default; (c) a date, not less than 30 days from the date the notice is given to Borrower, by which the default must be cured; and (d) that failure to cure the default on or before the date specified in the notice may result in acceleration of the sums secured by this Security Instrument, foreclosure by the judicial proceeding and sale of the Property.

The undisputed evidence showed that only twenty-eight days notice was given, supporting the factual basis of the defendants' affirmative defense.

The bank did not attempt to avoid this affirmative defense by providing an affidavit or other proof of record that its failure to comply with the explicit terms of its mortgage was not

a material breach of the contract or that it had substantially complied with the paragraph. The bank also did not provide any evidence of record establishing that the defendants were not prejudiced by its failure to comply with the terms of its agreement. Rather, in its supplemental affidavit of proof, the bank addressed the defendants' affirmative defense by simply stating that "the defendants alleged that the plaintiff failed to provide them with the contractual notice of default and right to cure contemplated by the loan documents. However, that allegation is factually incorrect." The record establishes that the defendants' allegation was not factually incorrect since the undisputed evidence shows that the bank failed to provide the notice required by the mortgage.

*194 Accordingly, since there were issues of fact raised by the affirmative defenses which were not refuted by the record, the bank was not entitled to receive a summary judgment. Importantly, the issue of materiality of any breach was not before the trial court in light of the bank's response to the affirmative defense.

In [Samaroo v. Wells Fargo Bank](#), 137 So.3d 1127 (Fla. 5th DCA 2014), this court rejected an argument that the bank substantially complied with a notice requirement identical to the instant mortgage provision. We held that the mortgage "specified the important information that it was bound to give its borrowers in default, and it simply failed to do so." *Id.* at 1129. In a footnote, we specifically noted that paragraph twenty-two of the mortgage specified five components that the bank must give, with one of those components being a specific thirty-day cure period. *See also Kurian*, 114 So.3d at 1053.

Accordingly, in my view, the bank was not entitled to receive a summary judgment and I would reverse and remand for further proceedings.

All Citations

171 So.3d 192, 40 Fla. L. Weekly D1806