

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

COLLEGIUM FUND LLC SERIES 10, A  
NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY  
COMPANY,  
Appellant,  
vs.  
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC, A  
DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY  
COMPANY,  
Respondent.

No. 78190-COA

**FILED**

**MAY 11 2020**

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY S. Young  
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE*

Collegium Fund LLC Series 10 (Collegium) appeals from a district court order granting a motion for summary judgment, certified as final pursuant to NRCP 54(b), in a quiet title action. Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County; Ronald J. Israel, Judge.

The original owners of the subject property failed to make periodic payments to their homeowners' association (HOA). The HOA recorded a notice of delinquent assessment lien and later a notice of default and election to sell to collect on the past due assessments and other fees pursuant to NRS Chapter 116. Collegium purchased the property at the resulting foreclosure sale and filed the underlying action seeking to quiet title against respondent Nationstar Mortgage LLC (Nationstar), the beneficiary of the first deed of trust on the property. Nationstar eventually moved for summary judgment, which the district court granted, finding that the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) owned the underlying loan such that 12 U.S.C. § 4617(j)(3) (the Federal Foreclosure Bar) prevented the foreclosure sale from extinguishing Nationstar's deed of trust. This appeal followed.


This court reviews a district court's order granting summary judgment de novo. *Wood v. Safeway, Inc.*, 121 Nev. 724, 729, 121 P.3d 1026, 1029 (2005). Summary judgment is proper if the pleadings and all other evidence on file demonstrate that no genuine issue of material fact exists and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *Id.* When deciding a summary judgment motion, all evidence must be viewed in a light most favorable to the nonmoving party. *Id.* General allegations and conclusory statements do not create genuine issues of fact. *Id.* at 731, 121 P.3d at 1030-31.

A review of the record from the underlying proceeding reveals that no genuine issue of material fact exists and that Nationstar is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *Id.* at 729, 121 P.3d at 1029. The declarations and business records produced by Nationstar, including the authorizations in the Fannie Mae Servicing Guide generally applicable to Fannie Mae's loan servicers, were sufficient to prove Fannie Mae's ownership of the note and the agency relationship between Fannie Mae and Nationstar in the absence of contrary evidence. *See Daisy Tr. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 135 Nev. 230, 234-36, 445 P.3d 846, 849-51 (2019) (affirming on similar evidence and concluding that neither the loan servicing agreement nor the original promissory note must be produced for the Federal Foreclosure Bar to apply). We reject Collegium's argument that Fannie Mae was required to be the beneficiary of the deed of trust or otherwise record its interest in order to avail itself of the Federal Foreclosure Bar. *See id.* at 233-34, 445 P.3d at 849 (holding that a deed of trust need not be assigned to a regulated entity in order for it to own the secured loan—meaning that Nevada's recording statutes are not implicated—where the deed of trust beneficiary is an agent of the note holder). Moreover, because Fannie Mae need not record its interest, any assertion that Collegium was a bona fide purchaser is inapposite. *See id.* at 234, 445 P.3d at 849.

Accordingly, the district court properly concluded that the Federal Foreclosure Bar prevented extinguishment of Nationstar's deed of trust and that Collegium took the property subject to it. *See Saticoy Bay LLC Series 9641 Christine View v. Fed. Nat'l Mortg. Ass'n*, 134 Nev. 270, 273-74, 417 P.3d 363, 367-68 (2018) (holding that the Federal Foreclosure Bar preempts NRS 116.3116 such that it prevents extinguishment of the property interest of regulated entities under FHFA conservatorship without affirmative FHFA consent). Thus, given the foregoing, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.<sup>1</sup>

  
\_\_\_\_\_, C.J.  
Gibbons

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Tao

  
\_\_\_\_\_, J.  
Bulla

cc: Hon. Ronald J. Israel, District Judge  
Clark Newberry Law Firm  
Akerman LLP/Las Vegas  
Fennemore Craig P.C./Reno  
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup>Insofar as the parties raise arguments that are not specifically addressed in this order, we have considered the same and conclude that they either do not present a basis for relief or need not be reached given the disposition of this appeal.